



भारत का राजपत्र

The Gazette of India

प्राधिकार से प्रकाशित

PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY

सं० 29]
No. 29]

नई दिल्ली, शनिवार, जुलाई 17, 1976/आषाढ़ 26, 1898
NEW DELHI, SATURDAY, JULY 17, 1976/ASADHA 26, 1898

इस भाग में भिन्न पृष्ठ संख्या दी जाती है जिससे कि यह अलग संकलन के रूप में रखा जा सके

Separate paging is given to this Part in order that it may be filed as a separate compilation

भाग II—खण्ड 3—उप-खण्ड (ii)

PART II—Section 3—Sub-section (ii)

(रक्षा मंत्रालय की छोड़कर) भारत सरकार के मंत्रालयों और (संघ राज्य क्षेत्र प्रशासनों की छोड़कर)

केन्द्रीय प्राधिकारियों द्वारा जारी किये गए सांविधिक आदेश और अधिसूचनाएं

Statutory orders and notifications issued by the Ministries of the Government of India
(other than the Ministry of Defence) by Central Authorities
(other than the Administrations of Union Territories)

मंत्रिमण्डल सचिवालय

(कार्मिक और प्रशासनिक सुधार विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 30 जून, 1976

क्रा० आ० 2563.—राष्ट्रपति, संविधान के अनुच्छेद 309 के परन्तुक और अनुच्छेद 148 के खण्ड (5) के द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए और भारतीय लेखा परीक्षा और लेखा विभाग में काम करने वाले व्यक्तियों की बाबत नियंत्रक, महानिष्ठा परीक्षक से परामर्श करने के पश्चात् केन्द्रीय सिविल सेवा (आचरण) नियम, 1964 में और संशोधन करने के लिए निम्नलिखित नियम बनाते हैं, अर्थात् :—

1. (1) इन नियमों का नाम केन्द्रीय सिविल सेवा (आचरण) द्वितीय संशोधन नियम, 1976 है।

(2) ये राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख को प्रवृत्त होंगे।

2. केन्द्रीय सिविल सेवा (आचरण) नियम, 1964 के नियम 4 में विद्यमान शीर्षक के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित शीर्षक रखा जाएगा अर्थात्—

“4. कम्पनियों या फर्मों में सरकारी सेवकों के निकट संबंधियों का नियोजन”

[सं० 25/19/74-स्थापना (ए)]

आर० सी० गुप्ता, अवर सचिव

CABINET SECRETARIAT

(Department of Personnel and Administrative Reforms)

New Delhi, the 30th June, 1976

S.O. 2563.—In exercise of the powers conferred by the proviso to article 309 and clause (5) of article 148, of the Constitution, and after consultation with the Comptroller and Auditor General in relation to persons serving in the Indian Audit and Accounts Department, the President hereby makes the following rules further to amend the Central Civil Services (Conduct) Rules, 1964, namely:—

1. (1) These rules may be called the Central Civil Services (Conduct) Second Amendment Rules, 1976.

(2) They shall come into force on the date of their publication in the Official Gazette.

2. In rule 4 of the Central Civil Services (Conduct) Rules, 1964, for the existing heading, the following heading shall be substituted:—

“4. Employment of near relatives of Government servants in Companies or firms”.

[No. 25/19/74-Estt.(A)]

R. C. GUPTA, Under Secy.

विधि, न्याय और कम्पनी कार्य मंत्रालय

(कम्पनी कार्य विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 28 जून, 1976

क्र.० आ० 2564:—एकाधिकार एवं निबंधनकारी व्यापार प्रथा अधिनियम 1969 (1969 का 54) की धारा 26 की उपधारा (3) के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा कथित अधिनियम के अस्तित्व में रखा हिन्दुस्तान मिल्क फूड मैनुफैक्चरर्स लिमिटेड के पंजीकरण (पंजीकरण के प्रमाणपत्र संख्या 414/70) के निरस्तीकरण को अधिसूचित करता है।

[सं० 22/32/72-एम 2]

एम० सी० वर्मा, उप सचिव

MINISTRY OF LAW, JUSTICE AND COMPANY AFFAIRS

(Department of Company Affairs)

New Delhi, the 28th June, 1976

S.O. 2564.—In pursuance of sub-section (3) of Section 26 of the monopolies and Restrictive Trade Practices Act, 1969 (54 of 1969), the Central Government hereby notifies the cancellation of the Registration of M/s. Hindustan Milkfood Manufacturers Limited under the said Act (Certificate of Registration No. 414/70).

[F. No. 22/32/72-M.I.L.]

M. C. VARMA, Dy. Secy.

गृह मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 28 जून, 1976

क्र.० आ० 2565:—राष्ट्रपति, संविधान के अनुच्छेद 239 के खण्ड (1) के अनुसरण में निवेश देते हैं कि भारत सरकार के गृह मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना सं० क्र.० आ० 2123 तारीख 29 अप्रैल, 1976 में निम्नलिखित संशोधन किए जाएंगे अर्थात्:—

उक्त अधिसूचना में खण्ड (च) में "उपधारा (1)" शब्द, कोष्ठक और अंक के पश्चात् "और उपधारा (3)" शब्द, कोष्ठक और अंक अन्तःस्थापित किए जाएंगे।

[सं० यू०-11030/4/76-यू० टी० एल०]

MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS

New Delhi, the 28th June, 1976

S.O. 2565.—In pursuance of clause (1) of article 239 of the Constitution, the President hereby directs that the following amendment shall be made in the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Home Affairs No. S.O. 2123 dated the 29th April, 1976, namely:—

In the said notification, in clause (f), after the word, brackets and figure "sub-section (1)", the words, brackets and figure "and sub-section (3)" shall be inserted.

[No. U-11030/4/76-UTL]

नई दिल्ली, 3 जुलाई, 1976

क्र.० आ० 2566:—संविधान के अनुच्छेद 239 के खण्ड (1) के अनुसरण में राष्ट्रपति एतद्वारा यह निवेश देते हैं कि पांडेचेरी संघ राज्य क्षेत्र के उप राज्यपाल, राष्ट्रपति के नियंत्रणाधीन तथा अगला प्रादेश जारी होने तक नगर भूमि (अधिकतम सीमा और विनियमन) अधिनियम,

1976 (1976 का 33) के निम्नलिखित उपबंधों के अस्तित्व में राज्य सरकारगत शक्तियों का प्रयोग करेंगे तथा कार्य करेंगे, नामतः:—

- (क) धारा 2 के खण्ड (घ), खण्ड (द) का उपखंड (ख) और खंड (ण) की व्याख्या के खंड (ख) का दूसरा परमबुद्ध
- (ख) धारा 7 की उप-धारा (2)
- (ग) धारा 10 की उप-धारा (5)
- (घ) धारा 11 की उप-धारा (1) और (3)
- (ङ) धारा 12 की उप-धारा (1) और (3)
- (च) धारा 14 की उप-धारा (1)
- (छ) धारा 19 की उप-धारा (1) के खण्ड (vi)
- (ज) धारा 20
- (झ) धारा 21 की उप-धारा (1)
- (झ) धारा 23 की उप-धारा (1)
- (ट) धारा 24 की उप-धारा (1)
- (ड) धारा 34
- (ड) धारा 35 तथा
- (ह) धारा 37

[यू०-11030/4/76-यू० टी० एल०]

आर० एल० परदीप, निदेशक

New Delhi, the 3rd July, 1976.

S.O. 2566.—In pursuance of clause (1) of article 239 of the Constitution, the President hereby directs that the Lieutenant Governor of the Union territory of Pondicherry shall, subject to the control of the President and until further orders, exercise the powers and discharge the functions of the State Government under the following provisions of the Urban Land (Ceiling and Regulation) Act, 1976 (33 of 1976), namely:—

- (a) clause (d), sub-clause (B) of clause (n) and the second proviso to clause (B) of the Explanation to clause (o), of section 2;
- (b) sub-section (2) of section 7;
- (c) sub-section (5) of section 10;
- (d) sub-sections (1) and (3) of section 11;
- (e) sub-section (1) and sub-section (3) of section 12;
- (f) sub-section (1) of section 14;
- (g) clause (vi) of sub-section (1) of section 19;
- (h) section 20;
- (i) sub-section (1) of section 21;
- (j) sub-section (1) of section 23;
- (k) sub-section (1) of section 24;
- (l) section 34;
- (m) section 35;
- (n) section 37.

[No. U-11030/4/76-UTL]

R. L. PRADEEP, Director.

वित्त मंत्रालय

(राजस्व और बैंकिंग विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 17 जून, 1976

आय-कर

क्र.० आ० 2567:—आय-कर अधिनियम, 1961 (1961 का 43) की धारा 2 के खण्ड (44) के उपखंड (iii) द्वारा प्रयुक्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार श्री जगराम कनोजिया को, जो केन्द्रीय

सरकार के राजपत्रित अधिकारी हैं, उक्त अधिनियम के अधीन कर वसूली अधिकारी की शक्तियों का प्रयोग करने के लिए प्राधिकृत करती है।

2. अधिसूचना सं० 400 (फा० सं० 404/167/73-आई०टी० सी०सी०) तारीख 30 जून, 1973 के अधीन की गई श्री एस. पी. सम्सेना की नियुक्ति श्री जगराम कनौजिया के कर वसूली अधिकारी के रूप में कार्य भार ग्रहण करने की तारीख से रद्द की जाती है।

3. यह अधिसूचना श्री जगराम कनौजिया के कर वसूली अधिकारी के रूप में कार्य-भार ग्रहण करने की तारीख से प्रवृत्त होगी।

[सं० 1357 (फा० सं० 404/126/76-आई०टी० सी०सी०)]

बी०पी० मित्तल, उप सचिव

MINISTRY OF FINANCE
(Department of Revenue and Banking)

New Delhi, the 17th June, 1976

INCOME TAX

S.O. 2567.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-clause (iii) of clause (44) of section 2 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961), the Central Government hereby authorises Shri Jagram Kanojia, who is a Gazetted Officer of the Central Government, to exercise the powers of a Tax Recovery Officer under the said Act.

2. The appointment of Shri S. P. Saxena made under Notification number 400 (F. No. 404/167/73-ITCC) dated 30th June, 1973 is cancelled with effect from the date Shri Jagram Kanojia takes over charge as Tax Recovery Officer.

3. This notification shall come into force with effect from the date Shri Jagram Kanojia takes over charge as a Tax Recovery Officer.

[No. 1357 (F. No. 404/126/76-ITCC)]

V. P. MITTAL, Dy. Secy.

(बैंकिंग पक्ष)

नई दिल्ली, 25 जून, 1976

फा० प्रा० 2568.—बैंककारी विनियमन अधिनियम, 1949 (1949 का 10) की धारा 53 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार, भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक की सिफारिश पर, एतद्वारा घोषित करती है कि उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 31 के उपबंध क्षेत्रीय ग्रामीण बैंक अधिनियम, 1976 (1976 का 21) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन स्थापित एवं नीचे दी गयी अनुसूची में उल्लिखित क्षेत्रीय ग्रामीण बैंकों पर उस सीमा तक लागू नहीं होंगे, जहां तक कि उपर्युक्त धारा 31 दिसम्बर, 1975, 31 दिसम्बर, 1976 और 31 दिसम्बर, 1977 को समाप्त होने वाले वर्षों के उनके तुलनपत्रों और लाभ-हानि लेखे तथा उन पर लेखा-परीक्षाओं के प्रतिवेदनों के प्रकाशन की अपेक्षा करती है।

अनुसूची

| क्रम संख्या | क्षेत्रीय ग्रामीण बैंकों का नाम |
|-------------|---|
| 1 | 2 |
| 1. | प्रथमा बैंक मुराबाबाद (उ०प्र०) |
| 2. | गोरखपुर क्षेत्रीय ग्रामीण बैंक, गोरखपुर (उ०प्र०) |
| 3. | हरियाणा क्षेत्रीय ग्रामीण बैंक, भिवानी (हरियाणा) |
| 4. | जयपुर नागौर आंचलिक ग्रामीण बैंक, जयपुर (राजस्थान) |
| 5. | गौड़ ग्रामीण बैंक, मालदा (पश्चिम बंगाल) |
| 6. | भोजपुर रोहतास ग्रामीण बैंक, आरा (बिहार) |

[सं० एफ० 4-57/76-ए० सी०]

सी० आर० बिश्वास, उप सचिव

(Banking Wing)

New Delhi, the 25th June, 1976

S.O. 2568.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 53 of the Banking Regulation Act, 1949 (10 of 1949), the Central Government, on the recommendation of the Reserve Bank of India, hereby declares that the provisions of section 31 of the said Act shall not apply to the Regional Rural Banks specified in the Schedule below, established under sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Regional Rural Banks Act, 1976 (21 of 1976), in so far as the said section requires the publication of the balance-sheets and profit and loss accounts together with the Auditors' Reports thereon in respect of the years ending the 31st December, 1975, 31st December, 1976 and 31st December, 1977.

SCHEDULE

| Sr. No. | Name of the Regional Rural Bank |
|---------|---|
| 1 | 2 |
| 1. | Prathama Bank, Moradabad (U.P.) |
| 2. | Gorakhpur Kshetriya Gramin Bank, Gorakhpur (U. P.) |
| 3. | Haryana Kshetriya Gramin Bank, Bhiwani (Haryana) |
| 4. | Jaipur Nagaur Aanchalik Gramin Bank, Jaipur (Rajasthan) |
| 5. | Gaur Gramin Bank, Malda (West Bengal) |
| 6. | Bhojpur Rohtas Gramin Bank, Arrah (Bihar) |

[No. F. 4-57/76-AC]

C. R. BISWAS, Dy. Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 1 जुलाई, 1976

फा० प्रा० 2569.—भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक अधिनियम, 1934 (1934 का 2) की धारा 42 की उप-धारा (1) की व्याख्या के खंड (ब) की मद (6) के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा उपर्युक्त मद (6) के प्रयोजनों के लिए, क्षेत्रीय ग्रामीण बैंक अधिनियम, 1976 (1976 का 21) की धारा 2 के खंड (ब) में परिभाषित एक क्षेत्रीय ग्रामीण बैंक को अधिसूचित करती है।

[सं० एफ० 4-21/76-ए० सी०]

New Delhi, the 1st July, 1976

S.O. 2569.—In pursuance of item (vi) of clause (d) of Explanation to sub-section (1) of section 42 of the Reserve Bank of India Act, 1934 (2 of 1934), the Central Government hereby notifies, for the purposes of the said item (vi), a Regional Rural Bank as defined in clause (f) of section 2 of the Regional Rural Banks Act, 1976 (21 of 1976).

[No. F. 4-21/76-AC]

नई दिल्ली, 2 जुलाई, 1976

फा० प्रा० 2570.—क्षेत्रीय ग्रामीण बैंक अधिनियम, 1976 (1976 का 21) की धारा 34 के साथ पठित धारा 11 के द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार, एतद्वारा भारत सरकार के वित्त मंत्रालय (बैंकिंग विभाग) की, भोजपुर-रोहतास ग्रामीण बैंक, आरा, के अध्यक्ष श्री पी० के० जैन की नियुक्ति विषयक, दिनांक 27 जनवरी, 1976 की अधिसूचना 4-70/75-ए० सी० 6 में निम्नलिखित संशोधन करती है अर्थात् :—

उपर्युक्त अधिसूचना के "30 जून, 1976" के अंकों, अक्षरों और शब्दों के स्थान पर "31 दिसम्बर, 1976" के अंक, अक्षर और शब्द प्रतिस्थापित होंगे।

[सं० एफ० 4-70/75-ए० सी०]

New Delhi, the 2nd July, 1976

S.O. 2570.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 11, read with section 34, of the Regional Rural Banks Act, 1976 (21 of 1976), the Central Government hereby makes the following amendments in the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Finance (Department of Banking) No. F. 4-70/75-AC-VI, dated the 20th January, 1976 relating to the appointment of Shri P. K. Jain as the Chairman of the Bhojpur Rohtas Gramin Bank, Arrah, namely :—

In the said notification, for the figures, letters and words "30th June, 1976", the figures, letters and words "31st December, 1976" shall be substituted.

[No. F. 4-70/75-AC]

फा० आ० 2571.—क्षेत्रीय ग्रामीण बैंक अधिनियम, 1976 (1976 का 21) की धारा 34 के साथ पठित धारा 11 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा, भारत सरकार के वित्त मन्त्रालय (बैंकिंग विभाग) की, तुंगभद्रा ग्रामीण बैंक, बेल्लारी के अध्यक्ष, श्री बी० ए० प्रभु की नियुक्ति विषयक, दिनांक 25 जनवरी, 1976 की अधिसूचना सं० एफ० 4-73/75-ए० सी०-6 में निम्नलिखित संशोधन करती है अर्थात् :—

उपर्युक्त अधिसूचना के "30 जून, 1976" के अको, अक्षरों और शब्दों के स्थान पर "31 दिसम्बर, 1976" के अक, अक्षर और शब्द प्रतिस्थापित होंगे।

[सं एफ० 4-73/75-ए० सी०]

S.O. 2571.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 11, read with section 34, of the Regional Rural Banks Act, 1976 (21 of 1976), the Central Government hereby makes the following amendments in the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Finance (Department of Banking) No. F. 4-73/75-AC-VI, dated the 25th January, 1976 relating to the appointment of Shri B. A. Prabhu as the Chairman of the Tungabhadra Gramin Bank, Bellary, namely :—

In the said notification, for the figures, letters and words "30th June, 1976", the figures, letters and words "31st December, 1976" shall be substituted.

[No. F. 4-73/75-AC]

फा० आ० 2572.—क्षेत्रीय ग्रामीण बैंक अधिनियम, 1976 (1976 का 21) की धारा 34 के साथ पठित धारा 11 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार, एतद्वारा, भारत सरकार के वित्त मन्त्रालय (बैंकिंग विभाग) की, क्षेत्रीय ग्रामीण बैंक, होशंगाबाद, के अध्यक्ष, श्री डी० एच० अम्बवानी की नियुक्ति विषयक, दिनांक 20 जनवरी, 1976 की अधिसूचना सं० एफ० 4-74/75-ए० सी० 6 में निम्नलिखित संशोधन करती है अर्थात् :—

उपर्युक्त अधिसूचना के "30 जून, 1976" के अको, अक्षरों और शब्दों के स्थान पर "31 दिसम्बर, 1976" के अक, अक्षर और शब्द प्रतिस्थापित होंगे।

[सं एफ० 4-74/75-ए० सी०]

हृषीकेश गुप्ता, अवर सचिव

S.O. 2572.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 11, read with section 34, of the Regional Rural Banks Act, 1976 (21 of 1976), the Central Government hereby makes the following amendments in the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Finance (Department of Banking) No. F. 4-74/75-AC-VI, dated the 20th January, 1976 relating to the appointment of Shri D. H. Ambwani as the Chairman of the Kshetriya Gramin Bank, Hoshangabad, namely :—

In the said notification, for the figures, letters and words "30th June, 1976", the figures, letters and words "31st December, 1976" shall be substituted.

[No. F. 4-74/75-AC]

H. K. GUHA, Under Secy.

नयी दिल्ली, 3 जुलाई, 1976

फा० आ० 2573.—बैंककारी विनियमन अधिनियम, 1949 (1949 का 10) की धारा 53 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार, भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक की सिफारिश पर, एतद्वारा घोषित करती है कि उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10 क के उपबन्ध 'बड़ी दोआब बैंक लिमिटेड, होशियारपुर पर 31 मार्च, 1977 तक लागू नहीं होंगे।

[सं 15 (22)-बी० ओ० III/76]

मे० आ० उसगांवकर, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 3rd July, 1976

S.O. 2573.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 53 of the Banking Regulation Act, 1949 (10 of 1949), the Central Government, on the recommendation of the Reserve Bank of India, hereby declares that the provisions of Section 10B of the said Act shall not apply to the Bari Doab Bank Limited, Hoshiarpur till the 31st March, 1977.

[No. 15(22)-B. O. III/76]

M. B. USGAONKAR, Under Secy.

(केन्द्रीय प्रत्यक्ष कर बोर्ड)

नई दिल्ली, 1 अप्रैल, 1976

आय-कर

फा० आ० 2574.—केन्द्रीय प्रत्यक्ष कर बोर्ड, आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 (1961 का 43) की धारा 122 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों और इस निमित्त उसे सशक्त करने वाली अन्य सभी शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए और अधिसूचना संख्या 1008 (फा० सं० 261/2/75/आई० टी० जे०) तारीख 1-8-1975 और सं० 1190 (फा० सं० 261/1/75-आई० टी० जे०) तारीख 1-1-1976 द्वारा सथा उपान्तरित अ० सं० 754 (फा० सं० 261/12/74-आई० टी० जे०) तारीख 31-10-1974 को प्राथमिक रूप से उपान्तरित करते हुए निदेश देता है कि :—

(1) अधिसूचना संख्या 754 (फा० सं० 261/12/74-आई० टी० जे०) तारीख 31 अक्तूबर, 1974 की क्रम संख्या 3 के सामने स्तंभ सं० 3 में निम्नलिखित प्रविष्टि की जाएगी :—

“(7) हरिद्वार सिकल रुड़की—”

(2) अधिसूचना सं० 1190 (फा० सं० 261/1/75-आई० टी० जे०) तारीख 1-1-1976 की क्रम संख्या 3 के सामने स्तंभ सं० 3 में निम्नलिखित प्रविष्टि जोड़ी जाएगी :

“(19) शामली सिकल, मुजफ्फरनगर—”

जहाँ कोई आयकर सिकल, बार्ड या जिला या उसका भाग इस अधिसूचना द्वारा एक रेंज से किसी अन्य रेंज को अन्तर्गत हो जाता है, वहाँ उस आयकर सिकल बार्ड या जिले या उसके भाग में किए गए निर्धारणों से उत्पन्न होने वाली और उस रेंज के, जिससे वह आयकर सिकल, बार्ड या जिला या उसका भाग अन्तर्गत हुआ है, सहायक आयकर आयुक्त (अपील) के समक्ष इस अधिसूचना की तारीख के ठीक पूर्व लखन अपीलें, उस तारीख में जिरा तारीख को यह अधिसूचना प्रभावी होती है, उग रेंज के, जिसको उक्त सिकल, बार्ड या जिला या उसका भाग अन्तर्गत हुआ

है सहायक आयकर आयुक्त (अधीन) को अन्तरित की जाएगी और उसके द्वारा उन पर कार्यवाही की जाएगी।

यह अधिसूचना 1-4-1976 से प्रभावी होगी।

[No. 1279/फा० सं० 261/4/76 आई० टी० जे०]

(Central Board of Direct Taxes)

New Delhi, the 1st April, 1976

INCOME-TAX

S.O. 2574.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 122 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961) and of all other powers enabling it in that behalf and in partial modification No. 754 (F. No. 261/12/74-ITJ), dated 31-10-74 as modified by notification No. 1008 (F. No. 261/1/75-ITJ), dated 1-8-75 and No. 1190 (F. No. 261/1/75-ITJ), dated 1-1-76, the Central Board of Direct Taxes hereby directs that,—

(1) the following entry shall be added in column No. 3 against Sl. No. 3 of the Notification No. 754 (F. No. 261/12/74-ITJ), dated 31st October, 1974 :—

“(vii) Hardwar Circle at Roorkee”

(2) the following entry shall be added in column No. 3 against Sl. No. 8 of the Notification No. 1190 (F. No. 261/1/75-ITJ), dated 1-1-1976 :—

“(xix) Shamli Circle at Muzaffarnagar”

Where an Income-tax Circle, Ward or District or part thereof stands transferred by this Notification from one Range to another Range, appeals arising out of assessments made in the Income-tax Circle, Ward or District or part thereof and pending immediately before the date of this Notification before the Appellate Assistant Commissioner of Income-tax Range from whom that Income-tax Circle, Ward or District or part thereof is transferred to and dealt with by the Appellate Assistant Commissioner of Income-tax of the Range to whom that said Circle, Ward or District or part thereof is transferred.

This notification shall take effect from 1-4-1976.

[No. 1279/F. No. 261/4/76-ITJ]

नई दिल्ली, 28 अप्रैल, 1976

आयकर

फा० प्रा० 2575—आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 (1961 का 43) की धारा 122 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों और इस निमित्त उसे समर्थ बनाने वाली अन्य सभी शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए और इस संबंध में सभी पूर्वतन अधिसूचनाओं को अधिकांत करते हुए, केन्द्रीय प्रत्यक्ष कर बोर्ड निदेश देता है कि नीचे की अनुसूची के स्तम्भ 2 में विनिर्दिष्ट रजों के सहायक आयकर आयुक्त (अधीन) उसके स्तम्भ 3 में तत्संबंधी प्रविष्टि में विनिर्दिष्ट आयकर सफिलो, वार्डों और जिलों में आयकर या अधिकार से निर्धारित सभी व्यक्तियों और आयों के बारे में अपने कृत्यों का पालन करेंगे।—

अनुसूची

| क्रम सं० | रेंज | आयकर सफिल, वार्ड और जिले |
|---------------------|---|--------------------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 1. विशेष रेंज, लखनऊ | 1 क वार्ड, सफिल-I, लखनऊ 2 ख वार्ड, सफिल-I, लखनऊ 3 ग-वार्ड, सफिल-I, लखनऊ | |

| 1 | 2 | 3 |
|------------------------------|---|---|
| | | 4. क वार्ड, सफिल-I, लखनऊ (जो 31-5-68 तक और तत्पश्चात् 18-6-68 से 1-6-69 और उसके पश्चात् तक मौजूद था) |
| | | 5. कम्पनी सफिल-I, लखनऊ |
| | | 6. विशेष सफिल, लखनऊ |
| | | 7 उध-सह-आयकर सफिल, लखनऊ |
| 2. क-रेंज, लखनऊ | | 1. सफिल I, लखनऊ, जिसमें (1) क वार्ड सफिल-I, लखनऊ (2) ख वार्ड-सफिल-I, लखनऊ (3) ग वार्ड-सफिल-I, लखनऊ सम्मिलित नहीं है। |
| | | 2. सफिल II, लखनऊ (जो 31-5-68 तक और 1-6-68 से 1-6-69 और तत्पश्चात् मौजूद था) क-वार्ड को छोड़कर। |
| | | 3. सर्वेक्षण, सफिल, लखनऊ |
| | | 4. लखीमपुर खेरी |
| | | 5. सीतापुर |
| | | 6. हरदोई |
| | | 7. संपदा-शुल्क एवं आयकर सफिल, इलाहाबाद |
| 3. ख-रेंज, लखनऊ | | 1. बेतन सफिल, लखनऊ |
| | | 2. गोरखपुर |
| | | 3. सर्वेक्षण सफिल, गोरखपुर |
| | | 4. बस्ती |
| | | 5. बहराइच |
| | | 6. गौंडा |
| | | 7. फैजाबाद |
| | | 8. आजमगढ़ |
| | | 9. बलिया |
| | | 10. जौनपुर |
| | | 11. सुलतानपुर |
| | | 12. देवरिया |
| | | 13. राय बरेली |
| | | 14. बाराबंकी |
| 4. इलाहाबाद-रेंज, इलाहाबाद | | 1. इलाहाबाद |
| | | 2. सर्वेक्षण सफिल, इलाहाबाद |
| | | 3. बेतन सफिल, इलाहाबाद |
| | | 4. मिर्जापुर |
| 5. वाराणसी-रेंज, वाराणसी | | 1. सफिल I, वाराणसी |
| | | 2. सफिल II, वाराणसी |
| | | 3. विशेष सफिल, वाराणसी |
| | | 4. विशेष सर्वेक्षण सफिल, वाराणसी |
| | | 5. परियोजना सफिल, वाराणसी |
| | | 6. सर्वेक्षण सफिल, वाराणसी |
| 6. मुरादाबाद-रेंज, मुरादाबाद | | मुरादाबाद |
| 7. बरेली-रेंज, बरेली | | 1. बरेली सफिल |
| | | 2. नैनीताल |

| 1 | 2 | 3 |
|---|---------------|---|
| | 3. हल्द्वानी | |
| | 4. चन्नीसी | |
| | 5. रामपुर | |
| | 6. शाहजहांपुर | |
| | 7. बवायूं | |
| | 8. काशीपुर | |
| | 9. अल्मोड़ा | |
| | 10. पीलीभीत | |
| | 11. नजीबाबाद | |
| | 12. बुलन्दशहर | |

जहाँ कोई आयकर सर्किल, वार्ड या जिला या उसका भाग इस अधिसूचना द्वारा एक रेंज से किसी अन्य रेंज को अन्तर्गत हो जाता है, वहाँ उस आयकर सर्किल वार्ड या जिले या उसके भाग में किए गए निर्धारणों से उत्पन्न होने वाली और उस रेंज के, जिससे वह आयकर सर्किल वार्ड या जिला या उसका भाग अन्तर्गत हुआ है, सहायक आयकर आयुक्त (अपील) के समक्ष इस अधिसूचना की तारीख के ठीक पूर्व लंबित अपीलें, उस तारीख से जिस तारीख को यह अधिसूचना प्रभावी होती है, उस रेंज के, जिसको उक्त सर्किल, वार्ड या जिला या उसका भाग अन्तर्गत हुआ है सहायक आयकर आयुक्त (अपील) को अन्तर्गत की जाएगी और उसके द्वारा उन पर कार्यवाही की जाएगी।

यह अधिसूचना 15-4-1976 से प्रभावी होगी।

[सं० 1283 फा० सं० 261/5/76 आई० टी० जे०]

एस० रामास्वामी, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 28th April, 1976

INCOME-TAX

S.O. 2575.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 122 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961) and of all other power enabling it in that behalf and in supersession of all previous Notifications in this regard, the Central Board of Direct Taxes hereby directs that Appellate Assistant Commissioners of Income-tax of the Ranges specified in Column 2 of the Schedule below shall perform their functions in respect of all persons and incomes assessed to income-tax and Super-tax in the Income-tax Circles, Wards and Districts specified in the corresponding entry in Column 3 thereof

SCHEDULE

| Sl. No. | Range | Income-tax Circles, Wards and Districts |
|---------------------------|-------|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 1. Special Range, Lucknow | | 1. A-Ward, Circle I, Lucknow 2. B-Ward, Circle I, Lucknow 3. C-Ward, Circle I, Lucknow 4. A-Ward, Circle II, Lucknow (which existed upto 31-5-68 to and thereafter 1-8-68 to 1-6-69 and thereafter). 5. Company Circle, Lucknow 6. Special Circle, Lucknow 7. E.D.-cum-Income-tax Circle Lucknow. |
| 2. A-RANGE, Lucknow | | 1. Circle I, Lucknow excluding : (i) A-Ward, Circle I, Lucknow. (ii) B-Ward, Circle I, Lucknow. (iii) C-Ward, Circle I, Lucknow. |

| 1 | 2 | 3 |
|--------------------------------|---|--|
| | | 2. Circle II, Lucknow (which existed up to 31-5-68 & from 1-8-68 to 1-6-69 and thereafter) excluding A-Ward. 3. Survey Circle, Lucknow 4. Lakhimpur Kheri 5. Sitapur 6. Hardoi 7. Estate Duty-cum-I.T. Circle, Allahabad. |
| 3. B-RANGE, Lucknow | | 1. Salary Circle, Lucknow 2. Gorakhpur 3. Survey Circle, Gorakhpur 4. Basti 5. Bahraich 6. Gonda 7. Faizabad 8. Azamgarh 9. Ballia 10. Jaunpur 11. Sultanpur 12. Deoria 13. Rae Bareilly 14. Barabanki. |
| 4. ALLAHABAD RANGE, Allahabad. | | 1. Allahabad 2. Survey Circle, Allahabad 3. Salary Circle, Allahabad 4. Mirzapur |
| 5. VARANASI RANGE, Varanasi | | 1. Circle I, Varanasi 2. Circle II, Varanasi 3. Special Circle, Varanasi 4. Spl. Survey Circle, Varanasi 5. Project Circle, Varanasi 6. Survey Circle, Varanasi |
| 6. MORADABAD RANGE, Moradabad | | Moradabad. |
| 7. BAREILLY RANGE, Bareilly | | 1. Bareilly Circle 2. Nainital 3. Haldwani 4. Chandausi 5. Rampur 6. Shahjahanpur 7. Budaun 8. Kashipur 9. Almora 10. Pilibhit 11. Najibabad 12. Bulandshahar. |

Whereas an Income-tax Circle, Ward or District or part thereof stands transferred by this Notification from one Range to another Range, appeals arising out of the assessments made in that Income-tax Circle, Ward or District or part thereof and pending immediately before the date of this Notification before the Appellate Assistant Commissioner of the Range from whom that Income-tax Circle, ward or District of part thereof is transferred shall from the date this Notification takes effect be transferred to and dealt with by the Appellate Assistant Commissioner of the Range to whom the said circle, ward, or District or part thereof is transferred.

This notification shall take effect from 15-4-1976.

EXPLANATORY NOTES

The amendment has been necessary for rationalising the Jurisdiction of Appellate Assistant Commissioners of Income-tax and their work load distribution; this also covers two newly created Circles at Rae Bareilly and Barabanki and modification of some other circles.

[No. 1283/F. No. 261/5/76-ITJ]

R. RAMASWAMI, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 13 अप्रैल, 1976

(आय-कर)

क्रमांक 2576.—केन्द्रीय प्रत्यक्ष कर बोर्ड, आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 (1961 का 43) की धारा 26 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, समय-समय पर यथासंशोधित अपनी अधिसूचना सं० I (फा० सं० 55/233/63-आई०टी०) तारीख 18 मई, 1964 से उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में निम्नलिखित संशोधन करती है।

2. उक्त अनुसूची के मव 42(छ) (iii) और मद 42(ज) (iv) का लोप किया जायेगा।

3. क्रम संख्या 42(ज)(7) के सामने स्तम्भ 2 में विद्यमान शब्दों के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित शब्द रखे जायेंगे:—

“महानेखापाल, पश्चिमी बंगाल या महानेखापाल केन्द्रीय कलकत्ता के संपरीक्षा नियंत्रण के अधीन सभी सरकारी पेंशन भोगी जिनका वार्षिक वेतन पूर्व वर्ष के दौरान उस अधिकतम रकम जिस पर तत्समय प्रयुक्त विधि के अधीन आयकर प्रभाय नहीं है, से अधिक हो गया है या उस रकम से कम होने पर भी जिस पर कतिपय कारणों से लोप पर कर की कटौती कर ली गई है।”

4. 42क से 42ज तक की सभी क्रम संख्याओं के सामने स्तम्भ 6 में विद्यमान प्रविष्टियों के स्थान पर, “आयकर आयुक्त जिसमें, केन्द्रीय वेतन सचिव, कलकत्ता पर अधिकारिता निहित है,” शब्द रखे जायेंगे।

5. यह अधिसूचना 13 अप्रैल, 1976 से प्रवृत्त होगी।

[फा० सं० 187/2/75 आई०टी०ए०-1]

एम० शास्त्री, भवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 13th April, 1976

(INCOME-TAX)

S.O. 2576.—In exercise of the powers conferred by the Section 126 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961), the Central Board of Direct Taxes hereby makes the following amendments in the Schedule annexed to its notification No. 1 (F. No. 55/233/63-IT) dated 18th May, 1964 as amended from time to time.

2. In the said schedule Item 42(G)(iii) and Item 42(H)-(iv) shall be deleted.

3. The existing wording in column 2 against Sl. No. 42(H)-(vii) shall be substituted by the following:—

“All Government Pensioners under the Audit Control of the A.G., West Bengal, or the A.G., Central Calcutta, whose annual salary during the previous year exceeded the maximum amount not chargeable to income-tax under the law for the time being in force or being less than that amount has for some reason been subjected to deduction of tax at source”.

4. The existing entries in column 6 against all the serial numbers 42E to 42H shall be substituted by the words “Commissioner of Income-tax who has been vested with the Jurisdiction over the Central Salaries Circle, Calcutta.”

5. This Notification shall come into force from the 13th April, 1976.

[F. No. 187/2/75-ITA-J]

M. SHASTRI, Under Secy.

RESERVE BANK OF INDIA

Central Office

(Department of Accounts and Expenditure)

Bombay, the 24th June, 1976

CORRIGENDUM

S.O. 2577.—In the statement of Affairs of the Reserve Bank of India, Banking Department for the week ended 16th April, 1976, published in Part II Section 3(ii) of the Gazette of India dated 29th May, 1976 the following corrigendum may be noted. On page 1820 the figures Rs. 15,00,00,000 under the head capital paid up may be read as Rs. 5,00,00,000 and Rs. 14,71,000 under head small coin may be read as Rs. 4,71,000.

[Gen. No. 819/4-75/76]
Chief Accountant

(Department of Expenditure)

New Delhi, the 30th June, 1976

S.O. 2578.—In exercise of the powers conferred by the proviso to article 309 and clause (5) of article 148 of the Constitution, the President, after consultation with Comptroller and Auditor-General in relation to persons serving in the Indian Audit and Accounts Department, hereby makes the following rules further to amend the General Provident Fund (Central Services) Rules 1960, namely:—

1. (1) These rules may be called the General Provident Fund (Central Services) seventh Amendment Rules, 1976.

(2) They shall come into force on the date of their publication in the Official Gazette.

2. In the General Provident Fund (Central Services) Rules, 1960;

(a) in rule 25, for sub-rule (1), the following sub-rule shall be substituted, namely:—

“(1) If a policy assigned to the President under rule 22 or under the corresponding rule heretofore in force, matures before the subscriber quits the service, or if a policy on the joint lives of a subscriber and the subscriber's wife or husband assigned under the said rule, or under the corresponding rule heretofore in force, falls due for payment by reasons of the death of the subscriber's wife or husband, the Accounts Officer shall save as provided by rule 28, realise the amount assured together with any accrued bonuses and shall place the amount so realised to the credit of the subscriber in the Fund.

Provident that if the amount assured together with the amount of any accrued bonuses is more than the whole of the amount withheld or withdrawn, it shall be the duty of the Accounts Officer to pay to the subscriber the difference, on receipt of a written application in this behalf.”

(b) the Fourth Schedule shall be omitted.

[No. F. 13(6)-EV(B)/76-GPF]

S.O. 2579.—In exercise of the powers conferred by the proviso to article 309 and clause (5) of article 148 of the Constitution, the President, after consultation with the Comptroller and Auditor General in relation to persons serving in the Indian Audit and Accounts Department, hereby makes the following rules further to amend the Contributory Provident Fund Rules (India), 1962, namely:—

1. (1) These rules may be called the Contributory Provident Fund (India) Fourth Amendment Rules, 1976;

(2) They shall come into force on the date of their publication in the Official Gazette.

2. In the Contributory Provident Fund Rules (India), 1962;

(a) in rule 27, for sub-rule(1), the following sub-rule shall be substituted, namely:—

“(1) If a policy assigned to the President under rule 24 matures before the subscriber quits the service,

or if a policy on the joint lives of a subscriber and his wife assigned under the said rule, falls due for payment by reasons of the wife's or husband's death, the Accounts Officer shall, save as provided by rule 30, realise the amount assured together with any accrued bonuses and shall place the amount so realised to the credit of the subscriber in the Fund.

Provided that if the amount assured together with the amount of any accrued bonuses is more than the whole of the amount withheld or withdrawn, it shall be the duty of the Accounts Officer to pay to the subscriber the difference, on receipt of a written application in this behalf.

(b) the Fourth Schedule shall be omitted.

[No. F. 13(6) EV (B)/76-CPF]

S. S. L. MALHOTRA, Under Secy.

(केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क समाहर्तालय)

पूना, 25 मार्च, 1976

सीमा शुल्क

का० प्रा० 2580.—सीमा शुल्क अधिनियम, 1962 की धारा 9 द्वारा प्रवृत्त तथा भारत सरकार, वित्त मंत्रालय की दिनांक 18 जुलाई, 1975 की अधिसूचना संख्या 79/सीमा-शुल्क—फा० सं० 473/2/75-सीमा शुल्क 7 द्वारा सीमा शुल्क के समाहर्ता को यथा प्रत्यायोजित शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, एतद्वारा, थाना जिन्हे का "मोहोने" ग्राम (ग्राम-पंचायत एरिया) को "भांडागार केन्द्र" घोषित किया जाता है।

[अधिसूचना सं० 4/सीमाशुल्क/76 फा० सं० 8 (सीमाशुल्क) 40-19/76]

जे० एम० वर्मा, केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क समाहर्ता

(Central Excise Collectorate)

Poona, the 25th March, 1976

CUSTOMS

S.O. 2580.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 9 of the Customs Act, 1962, as delegated to the Collector of Customs under Government of India, Ministry of Finance, Notification No. 79/Cus-F. No. 473/2/75-Cus-VII dated 18th July, 1975, the place by name "Mohone" village, (in Grampanchayat Area) Dist: Thana is hereby declared to be a "Warehousing Station".

[Notification No. 4/Cus/76 F. No. VIII(Cus)-40-19/76]

J. M. VERMA, Collector of Central Excise.

वाणिज्य मंत्रालय

(निर्यात उत्पादन विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 29 जून, 1976

(रबड़ नियंत्रण)

का० प्रा० 2581.—रबड़ नियम, 1955 के नियम 4 के साथ पठित, रबड़ अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 24) की धारा 4 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा यह अधिसूचित करती है कि उपर्युक्त अधिनियम की धारा 4 की उपधारा 3 के

खण्ड (3) के अन्तर्गत श्रीमती लीला दामोदर मेनन, संवद सदस्य को राज्य सभा द्वारा रबड़ बोर्ड के सदस्य के रूप में निर्वाचित किया गया है और वह इस अधिसूचना के प्रकाशन की तारीख से 23 सितम्बर, 1976 को समाप्त होने वाली अवधि के लिये, अथवा उस अवधि के लिए, जब तक वे राज्य सभा की सदस्य बनी रहे, जो भी कम हो, इस पद पर बनी रहेंगी।

[फा० सं० 15(4)/70-प्लांट (बी०)]

एस० महादेव अय्यर, अव्वर सचिव

MINISTRY OF COMMERCE

(Department of Export Production)

New Delhi, the 29th June, 1976

(RUBBER CONTROL)

S.O. 2581.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 4 of the Rubber Act, 1947 (24 of 1947), read with rule 4 of the Rubber Rules, 1955, the Central Government hereby notifies that Shrimati Leela Damodara Menon, Member of Parliament, has been elected by the Rajya Sabha as a member of the Rubber Board, under clause (e) sub-section (3) of Section 4 of the said Act and that she shall hold office for the period commencing from the date of publication of this notification and ending with 23rd September, 1976, or for the period during which she continues to be a member of Rajya Sabha, whichever is less.

[File No. 15(4)/70-Plant(B)]

S. MAHADEVA IYER, Under Secy.

(उप-मुख्य निर्यातक, आयात-निर्यात का कार्यालय)

आदेश

कानपुर, 20 अक्टूबर, 1975

का० प्रा० 2582.—सर्वोच्च अन्न उद्योग शाला, मेरठ शहर को गैर-निषेध, गैर-प्रतिबंधित रसायनो/रंजक मध्यस्थों के आयात के लिए निम्नलिखित लाइसेंस स्वीकृत किए गए थे:—

(1) पी०/एम०/1758279 दिनांक 14-7-72 मूल्य 5000/रुपये

(2) पी०/एस०/1758280 दिनांक 14-7-72 मूल्य 5000/रुपये

2. तत्पश्चात् उन्हें एक कारण बताओ सूचना संख्या डी सी सी आई एण्ड ई/ए-1/एम/75/इन्फ/एन की पुन आर/ए यू-कान/11 दिनांक 4-12-1974 यह प्रेषित हुई जारी की गई थी कि कारण बताओ सूचना की पावती से लेकर 15 दिनों के भीतर कारण बताओ उनके नाम में जारी किए गए उक्त लाइसेंस को क्यों न रद्द कर दिया जाना चाहिए और उन्हें इस आधार पर कि वे भूल से जारी कर दिए गए थे। उन्हें उनके मामले में व्यक्तिगत सुनवाई के लिए दिनांक 19-12-74 का दिन भी स्वीकृत किया गया था।

3. उक्त कारण बताओ सूचना के प्रति अभी तक कोई उत्तर प्राप्त नहीं हुआ है और उत्तर देने के लिए निर्धारित अवधि समाप्त हो गई है। इस प्रयोजन के लिए नियत तिथि को व्यक्तिगत सुनवाई के लिए कोई भी उपस्थित नहीं हुआ है।

4. अधोहस्ताक्षरी ने मामले की भली-भांति जांच कर ली है और इस परिणाम पर पहुंचा है कि चूंकि सर्वोच्च अन्न उद्योगशाला, मेरठ शहर के पास इस मामले में अपने बचाव के लिए कुछ नहीं है, इसलिए उन्होंने उक्त कारण बताओ सूचना के प्रति कोई उत्तर नहीं दिया है और व्यक्तिगत सुनवाई के लिए उपस्थित नहीं हुए हैं।

5. ऊपर की कठिनाइयों में जो कुछ बताया गया है, उसे ध्यान में रखते हुए अधोहस्ताक्षरी सन्तुष्ट है कि विषयाधीन लाइसेंस रद्द अथवा अप्रभावित किए जाने चाहिए। इसलिए, अधोहस्ताक्षरी यथा सशोधित

आयात (नियंत्रण) आदेश, 1955 दिनांक 7-12-1955 की धारा 9 उप-धारा (ए) के अन्तर्गत प्रदत्त अधिकारों का प्रयोग कर इसके द्वारा उक्त लाइसेंसों को रद्द करता है।

[संख्या डीसीसीआईएनई/ए-1/एम-75/इए/एनबीएनआर/एयू/कान]

(Office of the Dy. Chief Controller of Imports & Exports)
ORDER

Kanpur, the 20th October, 1975

S.O. 2582.—The following licences for the import of Chemicals/Dyesintermediates non-banned non-restricted were issued to M/s. Anant Udyogshala, Meerut city :—

1. P/S/1758279 dated 14-7-1972 for Rs. 5000.
2. P/S/1758280 dated 14-7-1972 for Rs. 5000.

2. Thereafter a Show Cause Notice No. DCCI&E/A. 1/AM-75/ENF/NBNR/AU/KAN/11 dated 4-12-1974 was issued to them asking to show cause within fifteen days of the date of receipt of notice as to why the said licences in their favour should not be cancelled on the ground that the same were issued inadvertently. They were also given 19-12-1974 for personal hearing of their matter.

3. No reply to the above said notice has been received so far and time stipulated for reply has expired. No one has also appeared for personal hearing on the date fixed for the purpose.

4. The undersigned has carefully considered the matter and has come to the conclusion that the said M/s. Anant Udyogshala, Meerut city have not replied to the notice and have not turned up for personal hearings, they have no defence to urge in the matter.

5. Having regard to what has been said in the preceding paragraphs the undersigned is satisfied that the licences in question should be cancelled or otherwise rendered ineffective. Therefore, the undersigned in exercise of the powers vested in him under clause 9 sub-clause (a) of the Imports (Control) Order 1955 dated 7-12-1955 as amended hereby cancels the above said licences.

[No. DCCI&E/A. 1/AM-75/ENF/NBNR/AU/KAN]

आदेश

कानपुर, 14 नवम्बर, 1975

क्रा० प्रा० 2583.—सर्वश्री फेडरल केमिकल एण्ड मेटल इंडस्ट्रीज, 87/6, हीरागंज कानपुर को गैर-निषेध, गैर-प्रतिबंधित किस्मों के रसायनों के आयात के लिये निम्नलिखित लाइसेंस जारी किये गये थे :—

1. पी/एस/1761394 दिनांक 25-3-73 मूल्य 20,000/- रु०
2. पी/एस/1761395 दिनांक 25-3-73 मूल्य 20,000/- रु०
3. पी/एस/1761750 दिनांक 29-3-73 मूल्य 5,000/- रु०
4. पी/एस/1761808 दिनांक 30-3-73 मूल्य 5,000/- रु०

2. उसके पश्चात् एक कारण निवेदन नोटिस सं० डी/सी/सी/आई/एनई/एफ-1/ए एम-75/इए/एन बी एन आर/ए यू/कान/9, दिनांक 4-12-74 उनको यह सूचित हुआ कि नोटिस की प्राप्ति की तिथि से 15 दिनों के भीतर कारण बताए कि उनको जारी किये गये उक्त लाइसेंस इस आधार पर रद्द क्यों न कर देने चाहियें कि वे मूल से जारी किये गये थे। उन्हें उनके मामले की व्यक्तिगत सुनवाई के लिए 19-12-74 का दिन भी दिया गया था।

3. उपर्युक्त कारण निवेदन नोटिस का अब तक कोई उत्तर प्राप्त नहीं हुआ है और उत्तर के लिये निर्धारित समय व्यतीत हो चुका है।

47 GI/76—2

व्यक्तिगत सुनवाई के लिये निश्चित तिथि को भी कोई उपस्थित नहीं हुआ है।

4. अधोहस्ताक्षरी ने मामले पर भली-भांति विचार कर लिया है और इस निर्णय पर पहुंचे हैं कि उक्त सर्वश्री फेडरल केमि० एण्ड मेटल इंड०, 87/6, हीरागंज, कानपुर ने कारण निवेदन नोटिस का उत्तर इसलिये नहीं दिया है क्योंकि उनके पास कोई तर्क बचाव के लिये नहीं है और यह कि लाइसेंस भूल से जारी किये गये थे।

5. पिछली कड़िकाओं में जो कुछ हो गया है उसको ध्यान में रखते हुए अधोहस्ताक्षरी यह निष्कर्ष निकालते हैं कि विषयाधीन लाइसेंस रद्द कर दिये जाने चाहियें या अन्यथा अप्रभावी कर दिये जाने चाहियें। इसलिये, यथासंशोधित आयात (नियंत्रण) आदेश, 1955 दिनांक 7-12-55 की धारा 9 उप-धारा (ए) द्वारा प्रदत्त अधिकारों का प्रयोग करते हुए उपर्युक्त लाइसेंस एतद्वारा रद्द किये जाते हैं।

[संख्या डी सी सी आई एन ई/एफ 1/ए एम-75/इए/एन बी एन आर/ए यू/कान]

ORDER

Kanpur, the 14th November, 1975

S.O. 2583.—The following licences for the import of Chemicals non-banned and non-restricted type were issued to M/s. Federal Chemical & Metal Industries, 87/6, Hiraganj Kanpur.

1. P/S/1761394 dated 25-3-73 for Rs. 20,000/-
2. P/S/1761395 dated 25-3-73 for Rs. 20,000/-
3. P/S/1761750 dated 29-3-73 for Rs. 5,000/-
4. P/S/1761808 dated 30-3-73 for Rs. 5,000/-

2. Thereafter a Show Cause Notice No. DCCI&E/F-1/AM-75/ENF/NBNR/AU/KAN/9, dated 4-12-74 was issued to them asking to show cause within fifteen days of the date of receipt of notice as to why the said licences in their favour should not be cancelled on the ground that the same were issued inadvertently. They were also given 19-12-74 for personal hearing of their matter.

3. No reply to the above said notice has been received so far and time stipulated for reply has expired. No one has also appeared for personal hearing on the date fixed for the purpose.

4. The undersigned has carefully considered the matter and has come to the conclusion that the said M/s. Federal Chemical & Metal Industries, 87/6, Hiraganj, Kanpur have not replied to the notice and have not turned up for personal hearings they have no defence to urge in the matter.

5. Having regard to what has been said in the preceding paragraphs the undersigned is satisfied that the licences in question should be cancelled or otherwise rendered ineffective. Therefore, the undersigned in exercise of the powers vested in him under clause 9 sub clause(A) of the imports (Control) Order, 1955, dated 7-12-1955 as amended hereby cancels the above said licences.

[No. DCCI&E/F-1/AM-75/ENF/NBNR/AU/KAN]

आदेश

क्रा० प्रा० 2584.—सर्वश्री फिलको इंडस्ट्रीज, 244/2, हरीकृष्ण बिल्डिंग, दिल्ली रोड, मेरठ को गैर-निषेध, गैर-प्रतिबंधित किस्मों के जाल बेयरिंग प्रावि के आयात के लिये निम्नलिखित लाइसेंस जारी किये गये थे ;

1. पी/एस/1758521 दिनांक 4-8-72 मूल्य 5,000 रु०
2. पी/एस/1758522 दिनांक 4-8-72 मूल्य 5,000 रु०

2. उसके पश्चात् एक कारण निर्देशन नोटिस सं० डी सी सी आई एड ई/एफ-3/ए एम-75/इन्फ/एन बी एन आर/एयू/कान/12633, दिनांक 30-1-75 उनको यह पूछते हुए जारी किया गया था कि नोटिस की प्राप्ति की तिथि से 15 दिनों के भीतर कारण बताए कि उनको जारी किये गये उक्त लाइसेंस इस आधार पर रद्द क्यों न कर देने चाहिये कि वे भूल से जारी किये गये थे । उन्हें उनके मामले की व्यक्तिगत सुनवाई के लिये 14-2-75 का दिन भी दिया गया था।

3. उपर्युक्त कारण निर्देशन नोटिस का अब तक कोई उत्तर प्राप्त नहीं हुआ है और उत्तर के लिये निर्धारित समय व्यतीत हो चुका है। व्यक्तिगत सुनवाई के लिये निश्चित तिथि को भी कोई उपस्थित नहीं हुआ है।

4. अधोहस्ताक्षरी ने मामले पर भली-भांति विचार कर लिया है और इस निर्णय पर पहुंचे हैं कि उक्त संबंधी फिल्को इंडो, 244/2, हरीकृष्ण बिल्डिंग दिल्ली रोड, मेरठ ने कारण निर्देशन नोटिस का उत्तर हमलिये नहीं दिया है क्योंकि उनके पास कोई तर्क बचाव के लिये नहीं है।

5. पिछली कड़िकाओं में जो कुछ कहा गया है उसको ध्यान में रखते हुए अधोहस्ताक्षरी संतुष्ट है कि विषयाधीन लाइसेंस रद्द कर दिये जाने चाहिये या अन्यथा अप्रभावी कर दिये जाने चाहिये। इस लिये, यथासंशोधित आयात (नियंत्रण) आदेश, 1955, दिनांक 7-12-1955 की धारा, 9 उप-धारा (ए) द्वारा प्रदत्त अधिकारों का प्रयोग करते हुए उपर्युक्त लाइसेंस एतद्द्वारा रद्द किये जाते हैं।

[संख्या : डी सी सी आई एड ई/एफ-3/ए एम-75/इन्फ/एन बी एन आर/एयू/कान]

ORDER

S.O. 2584.—The following licences for the import of Ball Bearings etc., non-banned and non-restricted type were issued to M/s. Filco Industries, 244/2 Hari Krishan Bldg. Delhi Road, Meerut :

1. P/S/1758521 dated 4-8-72 for Rs 5000/-

2. P/S/1758522 dated 4-8-72 for Rs. 5000/-

2. Thereafter a Show Cause Notice No. DCCI&E/F-3/AM-75/ENF/NBNR/AU/KAN/12633, dated 30-1-75 was issued to them asking to show cause within fifteen days of the date of receipt of notice as to why the said licences in their favour should not be cancelled on the ground that the same were issued inadvertently. They were also given 14-2-75 for personal hearing of their matter.

3. No reply to the above said notice has been received so far and time stipulated for reply has expired. No one has also appeared for personal hearing on the date fixed for the purpose.

4. The undersigned has carefully considered the matter and has come to the conclusion that the said M/s. Filco Industries, 244/2 Hari Krishan Bld. Delhi Road, Meerut have not replied to the notice and have not turned up for personal hearings as they have no defence to urge in the matter.

5. Having regard to what has been said in the preceding paragraphs the undersigned is satisfied that the licences in question should be cancelled or otherwise rendered ineffective. Therefore, the undersigned in exercise of the powers vested in him under clause 9 sub-clause (a) of the Imports (Control) Order, 1955, dated 7-12-1955 as amended hereby cancels the above said licences.

[No DCCI&E/F-3/AM-75/ENF/NBNR/AU/KAN]

आदेश

का०आ० 2585.—संबंधी गणेश तम्बाकू कार्यालय, कानपुर को गैर-निषेध, गैर प्रतिबंधित किस्मों के प्राकृतिक मसाले तेलों और सुगंधित रसायनों के आयात के लिये निम्नलिखित लाइसेंस जारी किये गये थे :—

1. पी/एस/1760358 दिनांक 11-1-73 मूल्य 5,000 रु०

2. पी/एस/1760359 दिनांक 11-1-73 मूल्य 5,000 रु०

2. उसके पश्चात् एक कारण निर्देशन नोटिस सं० डी सी सी आई एड ई/जी-3/ए एम-75/इन्फ/एन बी एन आर/एयू/कान/12636, दिनांक 30-1-75 उनको यह पूछते हुए जारी किया गया था कि नोटिस की प्राप्ति की तिथि से 15 दिनों के भीतर कारण बताए कि उनको जारी किये गये उक्त लाइसेंस इस आधार पर रद्द क्यों न कर देने चाहिये कि वे भूल से जारी किये गये थे। उन्हें उनके मामले की व्यक्तिगत सुनवाई के लिये 14-2-75 का दिन भी दिया गया था।

3. उपर्युक्त कारण निर्देशन नोटिस का अब तक कोई उत्तर प्राप्त नहीं हुआ है और उत्तर के लिये निर्धारित समय व्यतीत हो चुका है। व्यक्तिगत सुनवाई के लिये निश्चित तिथि को भी कोई उपस्थित नहीं हुआ है।

4. अधोहस्ताक्षरी ने मामले पर भली-भांति विचार कर लिया है और इस निर्णय पर पहुंचे हैं कि उक्त संबंधी गणेश तम्बाकू कार्यालय, कानपुर ने कारण निर्देशन नोटिस का उत्तर इसलिये नहीं दिया है क्योंकि उन के पास कोई तर्क बचाव के लिये नहीं है।

5. पिछली कड़िकाओं में जो कुछ कहा गया है उस को ध्यान में रखते हुए अधोहस्ताक्षरी संतुष्ट है कि विषयाधीन लाइसेंस रद्द कर दिये जाने चाहिये या अन्यथा अप्रभावी कर दिये जाने चाहिये। इसलिये, यथासंशोधित आयात (नियंत्रण) आदेश, 1955, दिनांक 7-12-55 को धारा 9, उप-धारा (ए) द्वारा प्रदत्त अधिकारों का प्रयोग करते हुए उपर्युक्त लाइसेंस एतद्द्वारा रद्द किये जाते हैं।

[संख्या : डी सी सी आई एड ई/जी-3/ए एम-75/इन्फ/एन बी एन आर/एयू/कान]

ORDER

S.O. 2585.—The following import licences for the import of Natural Essential Oils & Aromatic Chemicals non-banned and non-restricted type were issued to M/s. Ganesh Tambacu Karyalaya, Kanpur :—

1. P/S/1760358 dt. 11-1-73 for Rs. 5,000/-

2. P/S/1760359 dt. 11-1-73 for Rs. 5,000/-

(2) Thereafter a Show Cause Notice No. DCCI&E/G-3/AM-75/ENF/NBNR/AU/KAN/12636, dated 30-1-75 was issued to them asking to show cause within fifteen days of the date of receipt of notice as to why the said licences in their favour should not be cancelled on the ground that the same were issued inadvertently. They were also given 14-2-75 for personal hearing of their matter.

(3) No reply to the above said notice has been received so far and time stipulated for reply has expired. No one has also appeared for personal hearing on the date fixed for the purpose.

(4) The undersigned has carefully considered the matter and has come to the conclusion that the said M/s. Ganesh Tambacu Karyalaya, Kanpur have not replied to the notice and have not turned up for personal hearing as they have no defence to urge in the matter.

(5) Having regard to what has been said in the preceding paragraphs the undersigned is satisfied that the licences in question should be cancelled or otherwise rendered ineffective. Therefore, the undersigned in exercise of the powers vested in him under clause 9, sub-clause (a) of the Imports (Control) Order 1955, dated 7-12-1955 as amended hereby cancels the above said licences.

[No. DCCI&E/G-3/AM-75/ENF/NBNR/AU/KAN]

आदेश

कां०प्रा० 2586.—सर्वश्री गुप्ता इंजीनियरिंग वर्क्स, मीरापुर बस स्टैंड के पास जिला मुजफ्फरनगर को गैर-निबंध गैर-प्रतिबन्धित बाल बेयरिंग आदि के आयात के लिये निम्नलिखित लाइसेंस स्वीकृत किये गये थे —

1. पी/एस/1758869/दिनांक 5-9-72 मूल्य 5,000 रु०
2. पी/एस/1758870 दिनांक 5-9-72 मूल्य 2,500 रु०
3. पी/एस/1758871 दिनांक 5-9-72 मूल्य 2,500 रु०

2. तत्पश्चात् उन्हें एक कारण बताओ सूचना संख्या डी सी सी आई एंड ई/जी-5/ए एम-75/इन्फ/एन बी एन आर/एयू/कान/15607, दिनांक 6-2-75 यह पूछते हुए जारी की गई थी कि कारण बताओ सूचना की पावती से लेकर 15 दिनों के भीतर कारण बताए कि उनके नाम में जारी किये गये उक्त लाइसेंस इस आधार पर क्यों न रद्द कर दिए जाने चाहियें कि वे भूल से जारी कर दिये गये थे। उन्हें उनके मामले में व्यक्तिगत सुनवाई के लिये दिनांक 21-2-75 का दिन भी स्वीकृत किया गया था।

3. उक्त कारण बताओ सूचना के प्रति अभी तक कोई उत्तर प्राप्त नहीं हुआ है और उत्तर देने के लिये निर्धारित अवधि समाप्त हो गई है। इस प्रयोजन के लिये नियत तिथि को व्यक्तिगत सुनवाई के लिये कोई भी उपस्थित नहीं हुआ है।

4. अधोहस्ताक्षरी ने मामले की भली-भांति जांच कर ली है और इस परिणाम पर पहुंचा है कि चूंकि सर्वश्री गुप्ता इंजी० वर्क्स, मीरापुर बस स्टैंड के पास, जिला मुजफ्फरनगर के पास इस मामले में अपने बचाव के लिये कुछ नहीं है, इसलिए उन्होंने उक्त कारण बताओ सूचना के प्रति कोई उत्तर नहीं दिया है और व्यक्तिगत सुनवाई के लिये उपस्थित नहीं हुए हैं।

5. ऊपर की कड़िकाओं में जो कुछ बताया गया है, उसे ध्यान में रखते हुए अधोहस्ताक्षरी समुष्ट है कि विषयाधीन लाइसेंस रद्द अथवा प्रभावित किये जाने चाहिये। इसलिए, अधोहस्ताक्षरी यथा संशोधित आयात (नियंत्रण) आदेश, 1955 दिनांक 7-12-1955 की धारा 9, उप-धारा (ए) के अन्तर्गत प्रदत्त अधिकारों का प्रयोग कर इस के द्वारा उक्त लाइसेंसों को रद्द करता है।

[संख्या : डी सी सी आई एंड ई/जी-5/ए एम-75/इन्फ/एन बी एन आर/एयू/कान]

ORDER

S.O. 2586.—The following import licences of Ball-bearings etc. non-banned and non-restricted type were issued to M/s. Gupta Engineering Works, Near Bus Stand, Miranpur, Distt. Muzaffarnagar :—

1. P/S/1758869 dt. 5-9-72 for Rs. 5,000/-
2. P/S/1758870 dt. 5-9-72 for Rs. 2,500/-
3. P/S/1758871 dt. 5-9-72 for Rs. 2,500/-

(2) Thereafter a Show Cause Notice No. DCCI&E/G-5/AM-75/ENF/NBNR/AU/KAN/15607, dated 6-2-75 was issued to them asking to show cause within fifteen days of the date of receipt of notice as to why the said licences in their favour should not be cancelled on the ground that the same were issued inadvertently. They were also given 21-2-75 for personal hearing of their matter.

(3) No reply to the above said notice has been received so far and time stipulated for reply has expired. No one has also appeared for personal hearing on the date fixed for the purpose.

(4) The undersigned has carefully considered the matter and has come to the conclusion that the said M/s. Gupta Engineering Works, near Bus Stand, Miranpur, Muzaffarnagar have not replied to the notice and have not turned up for

personal hearing as they have no defence to urge in the matter.

(5) Having regard to what has been said in the preceding paragraphs the undersigned is satisfied that the licences in question should be cancelled or otherwise rendered ineffective. Therefore, the undersigned in exercise of the powers vested in him under clause 9, sub-clause (a) of the Imports (Control) Order, 1955 dated 7-12-1955 as amended hereby cancels the above said licences.

[No. DCCI&E/G-5/AM/ENF/NBNR/AU/KAN]

आदेश

कां०प्रा० 2587.—सर्वश्री गंगा इंडस्ट्रियल कार्पोरेशन, मेरठ को गैर-निबंध, गैर-प्रतिबन्धित टेपर रोलर बेयरिंग आदि के आयात के लिये निम्नलिखित लाइसेंस स्वीकृत किये गये थे —

1. पी/एस/1761978 दिनांक 30-3-73 मूल्य 5,000 रु०
2. पी/एस/1761979 दिनांक 30-3-73 मूल्य 5,000 रु०

2. तत्पश्चात् उन्हें एक कारण बताओ सूचना संख्या डी सी सी आई एंड ई/जी-8/ए एम-75/इन्फ/एन बी एन आर/एयू/कान/12638, दिनांक 30-1-75 यह पूछते हुए जारी की गई थी कि कारण बताओ सूचना की पावती से लेकर 15 दिनों के भीतर कारण बताए कि उनके नाम में जारी किये गये उक्त लाइसेंसों को इस आधार पर क्यों न रद्द कर दिया जाना चाहिये कि वे भूल से जारी कर दिये गये थे। उन्हें उनके मामले में व्यक्तिगत सुनवाई के लिये दिनांक 14-2-75 का दिन भी स्वीकृत किया गया था।

3. उक्त कारण बताओ सूचना के प्रति अभी तक कोई उत्तर प्राप्त नहीं हुआ है और उत्तर देने के लिये निर्धारित अवधि समाप्त हो गई है। इस प्रयोजन के लिये नियत तिथि को व्यक्तिगत सुनवाई के लिये कोई भी उपस्थित नहीं हुआ है।

4. अधोहस्ताक्षरी ने मामले की भली-भांति जांच कर ली है और इस परिणाम पर पहुंचा है कि चूंकि सर्वश्री गंगा इंडस्ट्रियल कार्पोरेशन, मेरठ के पास इस मामले में अपने बचाव के लिये कुछ नहीं है, इसलिए उन्होंने उक्त कारण बताओ सूचना के प्रति कोई उत्तर नहीं दिया है और व्यक्तिगत सुनवाई के लिये उपस्थित नहीं हुए हैं।

5. ऊपर की कड़िकाओं में जो कुछ बताया गया है, उसे ध्यान में रखते हुए अधोहस्ताक्षरी समुष्ट है कि विषयाधीन लाइसेंस रद्द अथवा प्रभावित किये जाने चाहिये। इसलिए, अधोहस्ताक्षरी यथा संशोधित आयात (नियंत्रण) आदेश, 1955 दिनांक 7-12-1955 की धारा 9 की उप-धारा (ए) के अन्तर्गत प्रदत्त अधिकारों का प्रयोग कर इसके द्वारा उक्त लाइसेंसों को रद्द करता है।

[संख्या : डी सी सी आई एंड ई/जी-8/ए एम-75/इन्फ/एन बी एन आर/एयू/कान]

ORDER

S.O. 2587.—The following licences for the import of Taper Roller bearings, etc. non-banned and non-restricted type were issued to M/s. Ganga Industrial Corporation, Meerut :—

1. P/S/1761978 dt 30-3-73 for Rs. 5000/-
2. P/S/1761979 dt 30-3-73 for Rs. 5000/-

(2) Thereafter a Show Cause Notice No. DCCI&E/G-8/AM-75/ENI/NBNR/AU/KAN/12638, dated 30-1-75 was issued to them asking to show cause within fifteen days of the date of receipt of notice as to why the said licences in their favour should not be cancelled on the ground that the same were issued inadvertently. They were also given 14-2-75 for personal hearing of their matter.

3. No reply to the above said notice has been received so far and time stipulated for reply has expired. No one has also appeared for personal hearing on the date fixed for the purpose.

(4) The undersigned has carefully considered the matter and has come to the conclusion that the said M/s. Ganga Industrial Corporation, Meerut have not replied to the notice and have not turned up for personal hearing they have no defence to urge in the matter.

(5) Having regard to what has been said in the preceding paragraphs the undersigned is satisfied that the licences in question should be cancelled or otherwise rendered ineffective. therefore, the undersigned in exercise of the powers vested in him under Clause 9 Sub-clause (a) of the Imports (Control) Order, 1955 dated 7-12-1955 as amended hereby cancels the above said licences.

[No. DCCI&E/G-8/AM-75/ENF/NBNR/AU/KAN]

आदेश

क्र०आ० 2588.—सर्वश्री गोविन्द साहजिग फैक्ट्री, कानपुर को गैर-निषेध गैर-प्रतिबन्धित बाल बेयरिंग आदि के आयात के लिये निम्नलिखित लाइसेंस स्वीकृत किये गये थे :—

1. पी/एस/1763482 दिनांक 29-8-73 मूल्य 24000 रु०
2. पी/एस/1763483 दिनांक 29-8-73 मूल्य 24000 रु०

2 तत्पश्चात् उन्हें एक कारण बताओ सूचना संख्या डी सी सी आई एंड ई/जी-9/ए एम-75/इन्फ/एन बी एन आर/ए यू/कान/12639 दिनांक 30-1-75 यह पूछते हुए जारी की गई थी कि कारण बताओ सूचना की पाबती से लेकर 15 दिनों के भीतर कारण बताय कि उनके नाम में जारी किये गये उक्त लाइसेंसों की क्यों न रद्द कर दिया जाना चाहिये और उन्हें इस आधार पर कि वे भूल से जारी कर दिए गये थे। उन्हें उनके मामले में व्यक्तिगत सुनवाई के लिये दिनांक 14-2-75 का दिन भी स्वीकृत किया गया था।

3. उक्त कारण बताओ सूचना के प्रति अभी तक कोई उत्तर प्राप्त नहीं हुआ है और उत्तर देने के लिये निर्धारित अवधि समाप्त हो गई है। इस प्रयोजन के लिये नियत तिथि को व्यक्तिगत सुनवाई के लिये कोई भी उपस्थित नहीं हुआ है।

4. अधोहस्ताक्षरी ने मामले की भली-भांति जांच कर ली है और इस परिणाम पर पहुंचा है कि चूंकि सर्वश्री गोविन्द साहजिग फैक्ट्री, कानपुर के पास इस मामले में अपने बचाव के लिये कुछ नहीं है, इसलिये उन्होंने उक्त कारण बताओ सूचना के प्रति कोई उत्तर नहीं दिया है और व्यक्तिगत सुनवाई के लिये उपस्थित नहीं हुए हैं।

5. ऊपर की कड़िकाओं में जो कुछ बताया गया है, उसे ध्यान में रखते हुए अधोहस्ताक्षरी संतुष्ट है कि विषयाधीन लाइसेंस रद्द अथवा अप्रभावित किये जाने चाहिये। इसलिये, अधोहस्ताक्षरी यथासंशोधित आयात (नियंत्रण) आदेश, 1955 दिनांक 7-12-1955 की धारा 9 उप-धारा (ए) के अन्तर्गत प्रदत्त अधिकारों का प्रयोग कर इसके द्वारा उक्त लाइसेंसों को रद्द करता है।

[संख्या डी सी सी आई एंड ई/जी-9/ए एम-75/इन्फ/एन बी एन आर/ए यू/कान]

ORDER

S.O. 2588.—The following licences for the import of Dyes Intermediates non-banned non-restricted type were issued to M/s. Govind Sizing Factory, Kanpur.

1. P/S/1763842 dt. for 29-8-73 for Rs. 24000/-
2. P/S/1763483 dt. 29-8-73 for Rs. 24000/-

(2) Thereafter a Show Cause Notice No. DCCI&E/G-9/AM-75/ENF/NBNR/AU/KAN/12639 dated 30-1-75 was

issued to them asking to show cause within fifteen days of the date of receipt of notice as to why the said licences in their favour should not be cancelled on the ground that the same were issued inadvertently. They were also given 14-2-75 for personal hearing of their matter.

(3) No reply to the above said notice has been received so far and time stipulated for reply has expired. No one has also appeared for personal hearing on the date fixed for the purpose.

(4) The undersigned has carefully considered the matter and has come to the conclusion that the said M/s. Govind Sizing Factory, Kanpur have not replied to the notice and have no defence to urge in the matter.

(5) Having regard to what has been said in the preceding paragraphs the undersigned is satisfied that the licences in question should be cancelled or otherwise rendered ineffective. Therefore, the undersigned in exercise of the powers vested in him under clause 9 sub-clause (a) of the Imports (Control) Order, 1955 dated 7-12-1955 as amended hereby cancels the above said licences.

[No. DCCI&E/G-9/AM-75/ENF/NBNR/AU/KAN]

आदेश

क्र०आ० 2589.—सर्वश्री गुप्ता इंजीनियरिंग कम्पनी, हापुड़ रोड, गाजियाबाद को गैर-निषेध गैर-प्रतिबन्धित बाल बेयरिंग आदि के आयात के लिये निम्नलिखित लाइसेंस स्वीकृत किये गये थे :—

1. पी/एस/1760374 दिनांक 11-1-73 मूल्य 20,000 रु०
2. पी/एस/1760375 दिनांक 11-1-73 मूल्य 20,000 रु०

2 तत्पश्चात् उन्हें एक कारण बताओ सूचना संख्या डी सी सी आई एंड ई/जी-12/ए एम-75/इन्फ/एन बी एन आर/ए यू/कान/15609 दिनांक 6-2-75 यह पूछते हुए जारी की गई थी कि कारण बताओ सूचना की पाबती से लेकर 15 दिनों के भीतर कारण बताएं कि उनके नाम में जारी किये गये उक्त लाइसेंसों की क्यों न रद्द कर दिया जाना चाहिये और उन्हें इस आधार पर कि वे भूल से जारी कर दिये गये थे। उन्हें उनके मामले में व्यक्तिगत सुनवाई के लिये दिनांक 21-2-75 का दिन भी स्वीकृत किया गया था।

3. उक्त कारण बताओ सूचना के प्रति अभी तक कोई उत्तर प्राप्त नहीं हुआ है और उत्तर देने के लिये निर्धारित अवधि समाप्त हो गई है। इस प्रयोजन के लिये नियत तिथि को व्यक्तिगत सुनवाई के लिये कोई भी उपस्थित नहीं हुआ है।

4. अधोहस्ताक्षरी ने मामले की भली-भांति जांच कर ली है और इस परिणाम पर पहुंचा है कि चूंकि सर्वश्री गुप्ता इंजीनियरिंग क०, हापुड़ रोड, गाजियाबाद के पास इस मामले में अपने बचाव के लिये कुछ नहीं है, इसलिये उन्होंने उक्त कारण बताओ सूचना के प्रति कोई उत्तर नहीं दिया है और व्यक्तिगत सुनवाई के लिये उपस्थित नहीं हुए हैं।

5. ऊपर की कड़िकाओं में जो कुछ बताया गया है, उसे ध्यान में रखते हुए अधोहस्ताक्षरी संतुष्ट है कि विषयाधीन लाइसेंस रद्द अथवा अप्रभावित किये जाने चाहिये। इसलिये, अधोहस्ताक्षरी यथा संशोधित आयात (नियंत्रण) आदेश, 1955 दिनांक 7-12-55 की धारा 9 की उप-धारा (ए) के अन्तर्गत प्रदत्त अधिकारों का प्रयोग कर इसके द्वारा उक्त लाइसेंसों को रद्द करता है।

[संख्या डी सी सी आई एंड ई/जी-12/ए एम 75/इन्फ/एन बी एन आर/ए यू/कान]

ORDER

S.O. 2589.—The following licences for the import of Ball-Bearings etc. non-banned and non-restricted type were issued to M/s. Gupta Engineering Co. Hapur Road, Ghaziabad.

1. P/S/1760374 dated 11-1-73 for Rs. 20000/-
2. P/S/1760375 dated 11-1-73 for Rs. 20000/-

2. Thereafter a Show Cause Notice No. DCCI&E/G-12/AM-75/ENF/NBNR/AU/KAN/15609 dated 6-2-75 was issued to them asking to show cause within fifteen days of the date of receipt of notice as to why the said licences in their favour should not be cancelled on the ground that the same were issued inadvertently. They were also given 21-2-75 for personal hearing of their matter.

3. No reply to the above said notice has been received so far and time stipulated for reply has expired. No one has also appeared for personal hearing on the date fixed for the purpose.

4. The undersigned has carefully considered the matter and has come to the conclusion that the said M/s. Gupta Engineering Co., Hapur Road, Ghaziabad have not replied to the notice and have not turned up for personal hearings they have no defence to urge in the matter.

5. Having regard to what has been said in the preceding paragraphs the undersigned is satisfied that the licences in question should be cancelled for otherwise rendered ineffective. Therefore, the undersigned in exercise of the powers vested in him under clause 9 sub-clause (a) of the Imports (Control) Order 1955 dated 7-12-1955 as amended hereby cancels the above said licences.

[No. DCCI&E/G-12/AM-75/ENF/NBNR/AU/KAN]

आदेश

क्र० प्र० 2590.—सर्वश्री गीता पम्पस, सहारनपुर को गैर-निषेध गैर-प्रतिबंधित बाल बेयरिंग आदि के आयात के लिये निम्नलिखित लाइसेंस स्वीकृत किये गये थे :—

1. पी/एस/1759510 दिनांक 26-10-72 मूल्य 22,460 रु०
2. पी/एस/1759511 दिनांक 26-10-72 मूल्य 22,460 रु०
3. पी/एस/1760517 दिनांक 18-1-73 मूल्य 29,985 रु०
4. पी/एस/1760519 दिनांक 18-1-73 मूल्य 14,992 रु०
5. पी/एस/1760518 दिनांक 18-1-73 मूल्य 14,992 रु०

2. तत्पश्चात् उन्हें एक कारण बताओ सूचना संख्या डी सी सी आई एंड ई/जी-20/ए एम-75/एनफ/एन बी एन आर/ए यू/कान/12642 दिनांक 30-1-75 यह पृष्ठों पर जारी की गई थी कि कारण बताओ सूचना की पावती से लेकर 15 दिनों के भीतर कारण बताएं कि उनके नाम में जारी किये गये उक्त लाइसेंसों को क्यों न रद्द कर दिया जाना चाहिये और उन्हें इस आधार पर कि वे भूल से जारी कर दिये गये थे। उन्हें उनके मामले में व्यक्तिगत सुनवाई के लिये दिनांक 14-2-75 का दिन भी स्वीकृत किया गया था।

3. उक्त कारण बताओ सूचना के प्रति अभी तक कोई उत्तर प्राप्त नहीं हुआ है और उत्तर देने के लिये निर्धारित अवधि समाप्त हो गई है। इस प्रयोजन के लिये नियत तिथि को व्यक्तिगत सुनवाई के लिये कोई भी उपस्थित नहीं हुआ है।

4. अधोहस्ताक्षरी ने मामले को भली भाँति जांच कर ली है और इस परिणाम पर पहुँचा है कि चूंकि सर्वश्री गीता पम्पस, सहारनपुर के पास इस मामले में अपने बचाव के लिये कुछ नहीं है, इसलिये उन्होंने उक्त कारण बताओ सूचना के प्रति कोई उत्तर नहीं दिया है और व्यक्तिगत सुनवाई के लिये उपस्थित नहीं हुए हैं।

5. ऊपर की कड़िकाओं में जो कुछ बताया गया है, उसे ध्यान में रखते हुए अधोहस्ताक्षरी सतुष्ट है कि विषयाधीन लाइसेंस रद्द अवश्या अप्रभावित किये जाने चाहिये। इसलिये, अधोहस्ताक्षरी यथा संशोधित आयात (नियंत्रण) आदेश, 1955 दिनांक 7-12-1955 की धारा 9 उप-धारा (ए) के अंतर्गत प्रश्त अधिकारी का प्रयोग कर इस के द्वारा उक्त लाइसेंसों को रद्द करता है।

[संख्या:—डी० सी० सी० आई० एंड ई०/जी०-20/ए० एम०-75/एनफ०/एन०

बी० एन० आर०/ए० यू०/कान०]

ORDER

S.O. 2590.—The following licences for the import of Ball bearings etc. non-banned non-restricted were issued to M/s. Gita Pumps Saharanpur.

1. P/S/1759510 dt. 26-10-72 for Rs. 22,460.
2. P/S/1759511 dt. 26-10-72 for Rs. 22,460.
3. P/S/1760517 dt. 18-1-73 for Rs. 29,985.
4. P/S/1760519 dt. 18-1-73 for Rs. 14,992.
5. P/S/1760518 dt. 18-1-73 for Rs. 14,992.

(2) Thereafter a Show Cause Notice No. DCCI&E/G. 10/AM-75/ENF/NBNR/AU/KAN/12642 dt. 30-1-75 was issued to them asking to show cause within fifteen days of the date of receipt of notice as to why the said licences in their favour should not be cancelled on the ground that the same were issued inadvertently. They were also given 14-2-1975 for personal hearing of their matter.

(3) No reply to the above said notice has been received so far and time stipulated for reply has expired. No one has also appeared for personal hearing on the date fixed for the purpose.

(4) The undersigned has carefully considered the matter and has come to the conclusion that the said M/s. Gita Pumps Saharanpur have not replied to the notice and have not turned up for personal hearings they have no defence to urge in the matter.

(5) Having regard to what has been said in the preceding paragraphs the undersigned is satisfied that the licences in question should be cancelled or otherwise rendered ineffective. Therefore, the undersigned in exercise of the powers vested in him under clause 9 sub-clause (a) of the Imports (Control) Order 1955 dated 7-12-1955 as amended hereby cancels the above said licences.

[No. DCCI&E/G-20-AM-75/ENF/NBNR/AU/KAN]

आदेश

क्र० प्र० 2591.—सर्वश्री हीरा लाल केदार नाथ, मथुरा को गैर-निषेध गैर-प्रतिबंधित रसायनों और रंजक मध्यस्थों के आयात के लिए निम्नलिखित लाइसेंस स्वीकृत किए गए थे :—

1. पी०/एस०/1763491 दिनांक 30-8-75 मूल्य 5000.-रु०
2. पी०/एस०/1763492 दिनांक 30-8-75 मूल्य 5000.-रु०

2. तत्पश्चात् उन्हें एक कारण बताओ सूचना संख्या डी सी सी आई एंड ई/एच 2/ए एम 75/एनफ/एन बी एन आर/ए यू/कान/5 दिनांक 2/3-12-75 यह पृष्ठों पर जारी की गई थी कि कारण बताओ सूचना की पावती से कर 15 दिनों के भीतर कारण बताएं कि उनके नाम में जारी किए गए उक्त लाइसेंसों को क्यों न रद्द कर दिया जाना चाहिए और उन्हें इस आधार पर कि वे भूल से जारी कर दिए गए थे। उन्हें उनके मामले में व्यक्तिगत सुनवाई के लिए दिनांक 17-12-74 का दिन भी स्वीकृत किया गया था।

3. उक्त कारण बताओ सूचना के प्रति अभी तक कोई उत्तर प्राप्त नहीं हुआ है और उत्तर देने के लिए निर्धारित अवधि समाप्त हो गई है। इस प्रयोजन के लिए नियत तिथि को व्यक्तिगत सुनवाई के लिए कोई भी उपस्थित नहीं हुआ है।

4. अधोहस्ताक्षरी ने मामले की भली-भांति जांच कर ली है और इस परिणाम पर पहुंचा है कि चूँकि सर्वश्री हीरा लाल केदार नाथ, मथुरा के पास इस मामले में अपने बचाव के लिए कुछ नहीं है, इसलिए उन्होंने उक्त कारण बताओ सूचना के प्रति कोई उत्तर नहीं दिया है और व्यक्तिगत सुनवाई के लिए उपस्थित नहीं हुए हैं।

5. ऊपर की कंडिकाओं में जो कुछ बताया गया है, उसे ध्यान में रखते हुए अधोहस्ताक्षरी संतुष्ट है कि विषयाधीन लाइसेंस रद्द अथवा अप्रभावित किए जाने चाहिए। इसलिए, अधोहस्ताक्षरी यथा संशोधित आयात (नियंत्रण) अधिनियम, 1955 दिनांक 7-12-1955 की धारा 9 उप-धारा (ए) के अन्तर्गत प्रदत्त अधिकारों का प्रयोग कर इस के द्वारा उक्त लाइसेंसों को रद्द करता है।

[संख्या --डी० सी० सी० आई० एड ई०/एच०-2/ए०एम०-75/इन्फ०/एन० बी० एन० आर०/ए० यू०/कान०]

ORDER

S.O. 2591.—The following licences for the import of Chemicals and Dyes Intermediates non-banned and non restricted type were issued to M/s. Hiralal Kedar Nath, Mathura.

1. P/S/1763491 dt. 30-8-75 for Rs. 5,000.
2. P/S/1763490 dt. 30-8-75 for Rs. 5,000.

(2) Thereafter a Show Cause Notice No. DCCI&E/H-2/AM-75/ENF/NBNR/AU/KAN/5 dated 2/3-12-74 was issued to them asking to show cause within fifteen days of the date of receipt of notice as to why the said licences in their favour should not be cancelled on the ground that the same were issued inadvertently. They are also given 17-12-1974 for personal hearing of their matter.

(3) No reply to the above said notice has been received so far and time stipulated for reply has expired. No one has also appeared for personal hearing on the date fixed for the purpose.

(4) The undersigned has carefully considered the matter and has come to the conclusion that the said M/s. Hira Lal, Kedar Nath, Mathura have not replied to the notice and have not turned up for personal hearings they have no defence to urge in the matter.

(5) Having regard to what has been said in the preceding paragraphs the undersigned is satisfied that the licences in question should be cancelled or otherwise rendered ineffective. Therefore, the undersigned in exercise of the powers vested in him under clause 9 sub-clause (a) of the Imports (Control) Order 1955 dated 7-12-1955 as amended hereby cancels the above said licences.

[No. DCCI&E/H-2/AM-75/ENF/NBNR/AU/KAN]

आदेश

का०आ० 2592.—सर्वश्री हरकुलिस इंजीनियरिंग कारपोरेशन, बॉम्बा, जी० टी० रोड, गाजियाबाद को गैर-निषेध गैर-प्रतिबंधित आयात के आयात के लिए निम्नलिखित लाइसेंस स्वीकृत किए गए थे :—

1. पी०/एस०/1760160 दिनांक 28-12-72 मूल्य 7795/-रु०
2. पी०/एस०/1760161 दिनांक 28-12-72 मूल्य 7795/-रु०

2. तत्पश्चात् उन्हें एक कारण बताओ सूचना संख्या डी० सी० सी० आई० एड ई०/एच०-4/ए०एम० 75/इन्फ०/एन० बी० एन० आर०/ए० यू०/कान०/17008 दिनांक 13-2-75 यह पृष्ठों पर जानी की गई थी कि कारण बताओ सूचना की पावती से लेकर 15 दिनों के भीतर कारण बताए कि उन

के नाम में जारी किए गए उक्त लाइसेंसों को क्यों न रद्द कर दिया जाना चाहिए और उन्हें इस आधार पर कि वे भूल से जारी कर दिए गए थे। उन्हें उनके मामले में व्यक्तिगत सुनवाई के लिए दिनांक 28-2-75 का दिन भी स्वीकृत किया गया था।

3. उक्त कारण बताओ सूचना के प्रति अभी तक कोई उत्तर प्राप्त नहीं हुआ है और उत्तर देने के लिए निर्धारित अवधि समाप्त हो गई है। इस प्रयोजन के लिए नियत तिथि को व्यक्तिगत सुनवाई के लिए कोई भी उपस्थित नहीं हुआ है।

4. अधोहस्ताक्षरी ने मामले की भली-भांति जांच कर ली है और इस परिणाम पर पहुंचा है कि चूँकि सर्वश्री-----के पास इस मामले में अपने बचाव के लिए कुछ नहीं है, इसलिए उन्होंने उक्त कारण बताओ सूचना के प्रति कोई उत्तर नहीं दिया है और व्यक्तिगत सुनवाई के लिए उपस्थित नहीं हुए हैं।

5. ऊपर की कंडिकाओं में जो कुछ बताया गया है, उसे ध्यान में रखते हुए अधोहस्ताक्षरी संतुष्ट है कि विषयाधीन लाइसेंस रद्द अथवा अप्रभावित किए जाने चाहिए, इसलिए अधोहस्ताक्षरी यथा संशोधित आयात (नियंत्रण) अधिनियम, 1955 दिनांक 7-12-1955 की धारा 9 उप-धारा (ए) के अन्तर्गत प्रदत्त अधिकारों का प्रयोग कर इस के द्वारा उक्त लाइसेंसों को रद्द करता है।

[संख्या --डी० सी० सी० आई० एड ई०/एच०-4/ए०एम०-75/इन्फ०/एन० बी० एन० आर०/ए० यू०/कान०]

ORDER

S.O. 2592.—The following licences for the import of Ball bearings etc. non-banned and non restricted type were issued to M/s. Hercules Engineering Corporation, Boniha, G. T. Road, Ghaziabad.

1. P/S/1760160 dt. 28-12-72 for Rs. 7795.
2. P/S/1760161 dt. 28-12-72 for Rs. 7795.

(2) Thereafter a Show Cause Notice No. DCCI&E/H-4/AM-75/ENF/NBNR/AU/KAN/17008 dated 13-2-75 was issued to them asking to show cause within fifteen days of the date of receipt of notice as to why the said licences in their favour should not be cancelled on the ground that the same were issued inadvertently. They were also given 28-2-75 for personal hearing of their matter.

(3) No reply to the above said notice has been received so far and time stipulated for reply has expired. No one has also appeared for personal hearing on the date fixed for the purpose.

(4) The undersigned has carefully considered the matter and has come to the conclusion that the said M/s. Hercules Engineering Corpn. Ghaziabad have not replied to the notice and have not turned up for personal hearings they have no defence to urge in the matter.

(5) Having regard to what has been said in the preceding paragraphs the undersigned is satisfied that the licences in question should be cancelled or otherwise rendered ineffective. Therefore, the undersigned in exercise of the powers vested in him under clause 9 sub-clause (a) of the Imports (Control) Order 1955 dated 7-12-1955 as amended hereby cancels the above said licences.

[No. DCCI&E/H-4/AM-75/ENF/NBNR/AU/KAN]

आदेश

का०आ० 2593.—सर्वश्री हिन्द बिस्फोट मैनुफैक्चरर्स, 109/30 नेहरू नगर कानपुर को गैर-निषेध गैर-प्रतिबंधित प्राकृतिक सुगन्ध तेल के आयात के लिए निम्नलिखित लाइसेंस स्वीकृत किए गए थे :—

- (1) पी०/एस०/1763449 दिनांक 24-8-73 मूल्य 5000 रु०
- (2) पी०/एस०/1763450 दिनांक 24-8-73 मूल्य 5000 रु०

2. तत्पश्चात् उन्हें एक कारण बताओ सूचना संख्या डी० सी० सी० आई०ई०/एच०-7/ए० एम० 75/इन्फ०/एन० बी० एन० आर०/ए० यू०/कान०/12644 दिनांक 30-1-75 यह पृष्ठों हुए जारी की गई थी कि कारण बताओ सूचना की पाबंदी से लेकर 15 दिनों के भीतर कारण बताएं कि उन के नाम में जारी किए गए उक्त लाइसेंसों को क्यों न रद्द कर दिया जाना चाहिए और उन्हें इस आधार पर कि वे भूल से जारी कर दिए गए थे। उन्हें उनके मामले में व्यक्तिगत सुनवाई के लिए दिनांक 14-2-75 का दिन भी स्वीकृत किया गया था।

3. उक्त कारण बताओ सूचना के प्रति अभी तक कोई उत्तर प्राप्त नहीं हुआ है और उत्तर देने के लिए निर्धारित अवधि समाप्त हो गई है। इस प्रयोजन के लिए नियत तिथि को व्यक्तिगत सुनवाई के लिए कोई भी उपस्थित नहीं हुआ है।

4. अधोहस्ताक्षरी ने मामले की भली-भांति जांच कर ली है और इस परिणाम पर पहुंचा है कि चूंकि सर्वश्री हिन्द बिस्किट मैनु०, 109/30 नेहरू नगर, कानपुर के पास इस मामले में अपने बचाव के लिए कुछ नहीं है, इसलिए उन्होंने उक्त कारण बताओ सूचना के प्रति कोई उत्तर नहीं दिया है और व्यक्तिगत सुनवाई के लिए उपस्थित नहीं हुए हैं।

5. ऊपर की कंडिकाओं में जो कुछ बताया गया है, उसे ध्यान में रखते हुए अधोहस्ताक्षरी संतुष्ट है कि विषयाधीन लाइसेंस रद्द अवकाश प्रभावित किए जाने चाहिए। इसलिए, अधोहस्ताक्षरी यथा संशोधित आयात (नियंत्रण) आदेश, 1955 दिनांक 7-12-1955 की धारा 9 उप-धारा (ए) के अन्तर्गत प्रदत्त अधिकारों का प्रयोग कर इस के द्वारा उक्त लाइसेंसों को रद्द करता है।

[संख्या:—डी० सी० सी० आई० ई०/एच०-7/ए० एम०-75/
इन्फ०/एन० बी० एन० आर०/ए० यू०/कान०]

ORDER

S.O. 2593.—The following licences for the import of Natural Essential Oil non-banned non-restricted were issued to M/s. Hind Biscuit Manufacturers, Kanpur.

1. P/S/1763499 dt. 24-8-73 for Rs. 5,000.
2. P/S/1763450 dt. 24-8-73 for Rs. 5,000.

(2) Thereafter a Show-Cause Notice No. DCCI&E/H-7/AM-75/ENF/NBNR/KAN/12644 dt. 30-1-75 was issued to them asking to show cause within fifteen days of the date of receipt of notice as to why the said licences in their favour should not be cancelled on the ground that the same were issued inadvertently. They were also given 14-2-75 for personal hearing of their matter.

(3) No reply to the above said notice has been received so far and time stipulated for reply has expired. No one has also appeared for personal hearing on the date fixed for the purpose.

(4) The undersigned has carefully considered the matter and has come to the conclusion that the said M/s. Hind Biscuit Manufacturers, Kanpur have not replied to the notice and have not turned up for personal hearings they have no defence to urge.

(5) Having regard to what has been said in the proceeding paragraphs the undersigned is satisfied that the licences in question should be cancelled or otherwise rendered ineffective. Therefore, the undersigned in exercise of the powers vested in him under clause 9 sub clause (a) of the Imports (Control) Order 1955 dated 7-12-1955 as amended hereby cancels the above said licences.

[No. DCCI&E/H-7/AM-75/ENF/NBNR/AU/KAN]

आदेश

का० आ० 2594.—सर्वश्री हिन्दुस्तान टोबैको एंड केमिकल कम्पनी कानपुर, को गैर-निषेध गैर-प्रतिबंधित सुगन्धित रसायनों के आयात के लिए निम्नलिखित लाइसेंस स्वीकृत किए गए थे:—

1. पी०/एस०/1762811 दिनांक 6-7-73 मूल्य 5000/- रुपये।
2. पी०/एस०/1762812 दिनांक 6-7-73 मूल्य 5000/- रुपये।

2. तत्पश्चात् उन्हें एक कारण बताओ सूचना संख्या डी सी सी आई ई/एच-8/ए० एम 75/इन्फ/एन बी एन आर/एयू/कान/17009 दिनांक 13-2-75 और प्राप्ति पाबंदी सहित पंजीकृत सम संख्या पत्र दिनांक 21-7-75 यह पृष्ठों हुए, जारी किये गए थे कि कारण बताओ सूचना की पाबंदी से लेकर 15 दिनों के भीतर कारण बताएं कि उन के नाम में जारी किए गए उक्त लाइसेंसों को क्यों न रद्द कर दिया जाना चाहिए और उन्हें इस आधार पर कि वे भूल से जारी कर दिए गए थे। उन्हें उनके मामले में व्यक्तिगत सुनवाई के लिए दिनांक 28-2-75 का दिन भी स्वीकृत किया गया था।

3. पाबंदी सहित पंजीकृत सम संख्या पत्र दिनांक 21-7-75 उपर्युक्त कारण निवेशन नोटिस के साथ डाक प्राधिकारियों ने अपनी अभ्युक्ति "छोड़ दिया" के साथ लौटा दिया है।

4. अधोहस्ताक्षरी ने मामले की भली-भांति जांच कर ली है और इस परिणाम पर पहुंचा है कि चूंकि सर्वश्री हिन्दुस्तान टोबैको एंड केमि० कं०, कानपुर के पास इस मामले में अपने बचाव के लिए कुछ नहीं है, इसलिए उन्होंने उक्त कारण बताओ सूचना के प्रति कोई उत्तर नहीं दिया है और व्यक्तिगत सुनवाई के लिए उपस्थित नहीं हुए हैं।

5. ऊपर की कंडिकाओं में जो कुछ बताया गया है, उसे ध्यान में रखते हुए अधोहस्ताक्षरी संतुष्ट है कि विषयाधीन लाइसेंस रद्द अवकाश प्रभावित किए जाने चाहिए। इसलिए अधोहस्ताक्षरी यथा संशोधित आयात (नियंत्रण) आदेश, 1955 दिनांक 7-12-1955 की धारा 9 उप-धारा (ए) के अन्तर्गत प्रदत्त अधिकारों का प्रयोग कर इस के द्वारा उक्त लाइसेंसों को रद्द करता है।

[संख्या: डी० सी० सी० आई० ई०/एच०-8/ए० एम० 75/
इन्फ/एन० बी० एन० आर०/ए० यू०/कान०]

ORDER

S.O. 2594.—The following licences for the import of Aromatic Chemicals non-banned and non-restricted type were issued to M/s. Hindustan Tobacco & Chemicals Co., Kanpur.

1. P/S/1762811 dt. 6-7-73 for Rs. 5,000.
2. P/S/1762812 dt. 6-7-73 for Rs. 5,000.

(2) Thereafter a Show Cause Notice No. DCCI&E/H-8/AM-75/ENF/NBNR/AU/KAN/17009 dated 13-2-75 and a Registered A.D. letter of even number dated 21-7-75 was issued to them asking to show cause within fifteen days of the date of receipt of notice as to why the said licences in their favour should not be cancelled on the ground that the same were issued inadvertently. They were also given 28-2-75 for personal hearing of their matter.

(3) The Regd. A.D. letter of even number of 21-7-75 along-with a copy of the above said show cause notice has been returned by the Postal authorities with their remarks "LEFT".

(4) The undersigned has carefully considered the matter and has come to the conclusion that the said M/s. Hindustan Tobacco and Chemical Co., Kanpur have avoided a reply to the show cause notice as they have no defence to urge and that the licences were issued inadvertently.

(5) Having regard to what has been said in the preceding paragraphs the undersigned is satisfied that the licences in question should be cancelled or otherwise rendered ineffective. Therefore, the undersigned in exercise of the powers vested in him under clause 9 sub-clause (a) of the Imports (Control) Order, 1955 dated 7-12-1955 as amended hereby cancels the above said licences.

[No. DCCI&F/H-8/AM-75/ENF/NBNR/AU/KAN]

आदेश

क्रा० प्रा० 2595.—सर्वश्री हिन्दुस्तान मैलिगबल स्टील कारपोरेशन, परतापुर, मेरठ को गैर-निषेध गैर-प्रतिबधित बाल बेयरिंग आदि के आयात के लिए निम्नलिखित लाइसेंस स्वीकृत किए गए थे :—

1. पी०/एस०/1758994 दिनांक 15-9-72 मूल्य 49340/- रुपये
2. पी०/एस०/1758995 दिनांक 15-9-72 मूल्य 24670/- रुपये
3. पी०/एस०/1758996 दिनांक 15-9-72 मूल्य 24670/- रुपये
4. पी०/एस०/1758997 दिनांक 15-9-72 मूल्य 49256/- रुपये
5. पी०/एस०/1758998 दिनांक 15-9-72 मूल्य 24564/- रुपये
6. पी०/एस०/1758999 दिनांक 15-9-72 मूल्य 24564/- रुपये
7. पी०/एस०/1760654 दिनांक 2-2-73 मूल्य 49371/- रुपये
8. पी०/एस०/1760655 दिनांक 2-2-73 मूल्य 24685/- रुपये
9. पी०/एस०/1760656 दिनांक 2-2-73 मूल्य 24685/- रुपये
10. पी०/एस०/1760657 दिनांक 2-2-73 मूल्य 36420/- रुपये
11. पी०/एस०/1760658 दिनांक 2-2-73 मूल्य 18210/- रुपये
12. पी०/एस०/1760659 दिनांक 2-2-73 मूल्य 18210/- रुपये

2 तत्पश्चात् उन्हें एक कारण बताओ सूचना डी सी सी आई एण्ड ई/एच-12/ए एम 75/इन्फ/एन बी एन आर/ए यू/कान/14030 दिनांक 3-2-75 यह पृष्ठों हुए जारी की गई थी कि कारण बताओ सूचना की पावती से लेकर 15 दिनों के भीतर कारण बताएं कि उन के नाम में जारी किए गए उक्त लाइसेंसों को क्यों न रद्द कर दिया जाना चाहिए और उन्हें इस आधार पर कि वे भूल में जारी कर दिए गए थे। उन्हें उनके मामले में व्यक्तिगत सुनवाई के लिए दिनांक 18-2-75 का दिन भी स्वीकृत किया गया था।

3 उक्त कारण बताओ सूचना के प्रति अभी तक कोई उत्तर प्राप्त नहीं हुआ है और उत्तर देने के लिए निर्धारित अवधि समाप्त हो गई है। इस प्रयोजन के लिए नियत तिथि को व्यक्तिगत सुनवाई के लिए कोई भी उपस्थित नहीं हुआ है।

4 अधोहस्ताक्षरी के मामले की भली-भांति जांच कर ली है और इस परिणाम पर पहुंचा है कि चूंकि सर्वश्री हिन्दुस्तान मैलिगबल स्टील कारपोरेशन, मेरठ के पास इस मामले में अपने बचाव के लिए कुछ नहीं है, इसलिए उन्होंने उक्त कारण बताओ सूचना के प्रति कोई उत्तर नहीं दिया है और व्यक्तिगत सुनवाई के लिए उपस्थित नहीं हुए हैं।

5 ऊपर की कठिकाणों में जो कुछ बताया गया है, उसे ध्यान में रखते हुए अधोहस्ताक्षरी सतुष्ट है कि विषयाधीन लाइसेंस रद्द अथवा अप्रभावित किए जाने चाहिए। इसलिए अधोहस्ताक्षरी यथा सशोधित आयात (नियंत्रण) आदेश, 1955 दिनांक 7-12-1955 की धारा 9 उप-धारा (ए) के अन्तर्गत प्रदत्त अधिकारों का प्रयोग कर इस के द्वारा उक्त लाइसेंसों को रद्द करता है।

[नमूना : डी सी सी आई एण्ड ई/एच-12/ए एम-75/इन्फ/एन/बी० एन०/आर/ए यू/कान]

ORDER

S.O. 2595.—The following licences for the import of Ball Bearings etc. non-banned non-restricted type were issued to M/s. Hindustan Malleable Steel Corpn., Partapur, Meerut.

1. P/S/1758994 dt. 15-9-72 Rs. 49,340.
2. P/S/1758995 dt. 15-9-72 Rs. 24,670.
3. P/S/1758996 dt. 15-9-72 Rs. 24,670.
4. P/S/1758997 dt. 15-9-72 Rs. 49,256.
5. P/S/1758998 dt. 15-9-72 Rs. 24,564.
6. P/S/1758999 dt. 15-9-72 Rs. 24,564.
7. P/S/1760654 dt. 2-2-73 Rs. 49,371.
8. P/S/1760655 dt. 2-2-73 Rs. 24,685.
9. P/S/1760656 dt. 2-2-73 Rs. 24,685.
10. P/S/1760657 dt. 2-2-73 Rs. 36,420.
11. P/S/1760658 dt. 2-2-73 Rs. 18,210.
12. P/S/1760659 dt. 2-2-73 Rs. 18,210.

(2) Thereafter a Show Cause Notice No. DCCI&E/H-12/AM-75/ENF/NBNR/AU/KAN/14030 dated 3-2-75 was issued to them asking to show cause within fifteen days of the date of receipt of notice as to why the said licences in their favour should not be cancelled on the ground that the same were issued inadvertently. They were also given 18-2-75 for personal hearing of their matter.

(3) No reply to the above said notice has been received so far and time stipulated for reply has expired. No one has also appeared for personal hearing on the date fixed for the purpose.

(4) The undersigned has carefully considered the matter and has come to the conclusion that the said M/s. Hindustan Malleable Steel Corpn., Meerut, have not replied to the notice and turned up for personal hearings they have no defence to urge in the matter.

(5) Having regard to what has been said in the preceding paragraphs the undersigned is satisfied that the licences in question should be cancelled or otherwise rendered ineffective. Therefore, the undersigned in exercise of the powers vested in him under clause 9 sub-clause (a) of the Imports (Control) Order 1955 dated 7-12-1955 as amended hereby cancels the above said licences.

[No. DCCI&E/H-12/AM-75/ENF/NBNR/AU/KAN]

आदेश

क्रा० प्रा० 2596.—सर्वश्री हिन्दुस्तान एग्री इंस्ट्रूज, गांव तथा डाकघर किठोर, जिला मेरठ को गैर-निषेध गैर-प्रतिबधित बाल बेयरिंग आदि के आयात के लिए निम्नलिखित लाइसेंस स्वीकृत किए गए थे :—

1. पी०/एस०/1759348 दिनांक 5-10-72 मूल्य 7490/- रुपये
2. पी०/एस०/1759349 दिनांक 5-10-72 मूल्य 7490/- रुपये
3. पी०/एस०/1759659 दिनांक 10-11-72 मूल्य 7498/- रुपये
4. पी०/एस०/1759660 दिनांक 10-11-72 मूल्य 7498/- रुपये
5. पी०/एस०/1760553 दिनांक 19-1-72 मूल्य 16200/- रुपये
6. पी०/एस०/1760554 दिनांक 19-1-73 मूल्य 16200/- रुपये

2 तत्पश्चात् उन्हें एक कारण बताओ सूचना संख्या डी सी सी आई एण्ड ई/एच-13/ए एम 75/इन्फ/एन बी एन आर/ए यू/कान/1568 दिनांक 6-2-75 यह पृष्ठों हुए जारी की गई थी कि कारण बताओ सूचना की पावती से लेकर 15 दिनों के भीतर कारण बताएं कि उन के नाम में जारी किए गए उक्त लाइसेंसों को क्यों न रद्द कर दिया जाना चाहिए और उन्हें इस आधार पर कि वे भूल में जारी कर दिए गए थे। उन्हें उनके मामले में व्यक्तिगत सुनवाई के लिए दिनांक 21-2-75 का दिन भी स्वीकृत किया गया था।

3 उक्त कारण बताओ सूचना के प्रति अभी तक कोई उत्तर प्राप्त नहीं हुआ है और उत्तर देने के लिए निर्धारित अवधि समाप्त हो गई है। इस प्रयोजन के लिए नियत तिथि को व्यक्तिगत सुनवाई के लिए कोई भी उपस्थित नहीं हुआ है।

4 अधोहस्ताक्षरी ने मामले की भली-भांति जांच कर ली है और इस परिणाम पर पहुंचा है कि चूंकि सर्वश्री हि० एग्री० इं०, गांव तथा डाकघर किठोर, जिला मेरठ के पास इस मामले में अपने बचाव के लिए कुछ नहीं है, इसलिए उन्होंने उक्त कारण बताओ सूचना के प्रति कोई उत्तर नहीं दिया है और व्यक्तिगत सुनवाई के लिए उपस्थित नहीं हुए हैं।

5. ऊपर की कंडिकाओं में जो कुछ बताया गया है, उसे ध्यान में रखते हुए अधोहस्ताक्षरी संतुष्ट है कि विषयाधीन लाइसेंस रद्द अथवा अप्रभावित किए जाने चाहिए। इसलिए अधोहस्ताक्षरी यथा संशोधित आयात (नियंत्रण) आदेश, 1955 दिनांक 7-12-1955 की धारा 9 उप-धारा (ए) के अन्तर्गत प्रवक्त अधिकारों का प्रयोग कर इसके द्वारा उक्त लाइसेंसों को रद्द करता है।

[संख्या. डी० सी० सी० आई० एंड ई०/एच०-13/ए० एम० 75/इस्क०/एन० बी० एन० आर०/ए० यू०/कान०]

ORDER

S.O. 2596.—The following licences for the import of Ball Bearings etc. non-banned non-restricted type were issued to M/s. Hindustan Agro Industries, Village & Post Kithore, Distt. Meerut.

1. P/S/1759348 dated 5-10-1972 for Rs. 7490.
2. P/S/1759349 dated 5-10-1972 for Rs. 7490.
3. P/S/1759659 dated 10-11-1972 for Rs. 7498.
4. P/S/1759660 dated 10-11-1972 for Rs. 7498.
5. P/S/1760553 dated 19-1-1973 for Rs. 16200.
6. P/S/1760554 dated 19-1-1973 for Rs. 16200.

(2) Thereafter a Show Cause Notice No. DCCI&E/H-13/AM-75/ENF/NBNR/AU/KAN/15618 dated 6-2-1975 was issued to them asking to show cause within fifteen days of the date of receipt of notice as to why the said licences in their favour should not be cancelled on the ground that the same were issued inadvertently. They were also given 21-2-1975 for personal hearing of their matter.

(3) No reply to the above said notice has been received so far and time stipulated for reply has expired. No one has also appeared for personal hearing on the date fixed for the purpose.

(4) The undersigned has carefully considered the matter and has come to the conclusion that the said M/s. Hindustan Agro Industries, Village & Post Kithore, Distt. Meerut, have not replied to the notice and have not turned up for personal hearing they have no defence to urge in the matter.

(5) Having regard to what has been said in the preceding paragraphs the undersigned is satisfied that the licences in question should be cancelled or otherwise rendered ineffective. Therefore the undersigned in exercise of the powers vested in him under clause 9 sub-clause (a) of the Imports (Control) Order 1955 dated 7-12-1955 as amended hereby cancels the above said licences.

[No. DCCI&E/H-13/AM-75/ENF/NBNR/AU/KAN]

आदेश

कानूनां 2597—सर्वश्री हरियाणा इंजीनियरिंग कं०, गाजियाबाद को गैर-निषेध गैर-प्रतिबंधित बाल बेयरिंग आदि के आयात के लिए निम्नलिखित लाइसेंस स्वीकृत किए गए थे:—

1. पी०/एस०/1759726 दिनांक 17-11-72 मूल्य 33203/रुपये
2. पी०/एस०/1759727 दिनांक 17-11-72 मूल्य 16601/रुपये
3. पी०/एस०/1759728 दिनांक 17-11-72 मूल्य 16601/रुपये
4. पी०/एस०/1759729 दिनांक 17-11-72 मूल्य 36569/रुपये
5. पी०/एस०/1759730 दिनांक 17-11-72 मूल्य 18294/रुपये
6. पी०/एस०/1759731 दिनांक 17-11-72 मूल्य 18294/रुपये
7. पी०/एस०/1759732 दिनांक 17-11-72 मूल्य 38783/रुपये
8. पी०/एस०/1759733 दिनांक 17-11-72 मूल्य 19394/रुपये
9. पी०/एस०/1759734 दिनांक 17-11-72 मूल्य 19394/रुपये
10. पी०/एस०/1762999 दिनांक 20-7-73 मूल्य 51600/रुपये
11. पी०/एस०/1763000 दिनांक 20-7-73 मूल्य 54600/रुपये

2. तत्पश्चात् उन्हें एक कारण बताओ सूचना संख्या डी सी सी आई एण्ड ई/एच-15/एएम/75/इस्क/एन बी एन आर/ए यू/कान/14039 दिनांक 3-2-75 और एक पंजीकृत सम संख्या पत्र दिनांक 6-8-75 यह पूछते हुए जारी की गई थी कि कारण बताओ सूचना की पावती से लेकर 15 दिनों के भीतर कारण बताएं कि उन के नाम में जारी किए गए उक्त लाइसेंसों को क्यों न रद्द कर दिया जाना चाहिए और उन्हें इस आधार पर कि वे भूल से जारी कर दिए गए थे। उन्हें उनके मामले में व्यक्तिगत सुनवाई के लिए दिनांक 18-2-75 का दिन भी स्वीकृत किया गया था।

3. उपर्युक्त पंजीकृत सम संख्या पत्र दिनांक 6-8-75 डाक प्राधिकारियों द्वारा "ताला लगा है, लौटाया जाता है" अभ्युक्ति के साथ लौटा दिया गया है।

4. अधोहस्ताक्षरी ने मामले की भली-भांति जांच कर ली है और इस परिणाम पर पहुंचा है कि चूंकि सर्वश्री हरियाणा इंजीनियरिंग कम्पनी, गाजियाबाद के पास इस मामले में अपने बचाव के लिए कुछ नहीं है इसलिए उन्होंने उक्त कारण बताओ सूचना के प्रति कोई उत्तर नहीं दिया है और व्यक्तिगत सुनवाई के लिए उपस्थित नहीं हुए हैं।

5. ऊपर की कंडिकाओं में जो कुछ बताया गया है, उसे ध्यान में रखते हुए अधोहस्ताक्षरी संतुष्ट है कि विषयाधीन लाइसेंस रद्द अथवा अप्रभावित किए जाने चाहिए। इसलिए अधोहस्ताक्षरी यथा संशोधित आयात (नियंत्रण) आदेश 1955 दिनांक 7-12-1955 की धारा 9 उप-धारा (ए) के अन्तर्गत प्रवक्त अधिकारों का प्रयोग कर इस के द्वारा उक्त लाइसेंसों को रद्द करता है।

[संख्या:—डी० सी० सी० आई० एंड ई०/एच०-15/ए० एम०-75 इस्क०/एन० बी० एन० आर०/ए० यू०/कान०]

डी० एस० मोरक्रीमा, उप-मुख्य नियंत्रक

ORDER

S.O. 2597.—The following licences for the import of ball bearings non banned non restricted were issued to M/s. Haryana Engg. Co. Ghaziabad.

1. P/S/1759726 dated 17-11-1972 for Rs. 33203.
2. P/S/1759727 dated 17-11-1972 for Rs. 16601.
3. P/S/1759728 dated 17-11-1972 for Rs. 16601.
4. P/S/1759729 dated 17-11-1972 for Rs. 36569.
5. P/S/1759730 dated 17-11-1972 for Rs. 18294.
6. P/S/1759731 dated 17-11-1972 for Rs. 18294.
7. P/S/1759732 dated 17-11-1972 for Rs. 38783.
8. P/S/1759733 dated 17-11-1972 for Rs. 19394.
9. P/S/1759734 dated 17-11-1972 for Rs. 19394.
10. P/S/1762999 dated 20-7-1973 for Rs. 54600.
11. P/S/1763000 dated 20-7-1973 for Rs. 54600.

2. Thereafter a Show Cause Notice No. DCCI&E/H-15/AM-75/NBNR/AU/KAN/14039 dated 3-2-1975 and a Regd. letter of even number dated 6-8-1975 was issued to them asking to show cause within fifteen days of the date of receipt of notice as to why the said licences in their favour should not be cancelled on the ground that the same were issued inadvertently. They were also given 18-2-1975 for personal hearing of their matter.

3. The above said regd. letter of even number dated 6-8-1975 has been returned undelivered by the Postal authorities with their remarks "Locked returned."

4. The undersigned has carefully considered the matter and has come to the conclusion that the said M/s. Haryana Engg. Co. Ghaziabad have avoided a reply to the show cause notice as they have no defence to urge and that the licences were issued inadvertently.

(5) Having regard to what has been said in the preceding paragraphs the undersigned is satisfied that the licences in question should be cancelled or otherwise rendered ineffective. Therefore the undersigned in exercise of the powers vested in him under clause 9 sub-clause (a) of the Imports (Control) Order 1955 dated 7-12-1955 as amended hereby cancels the above said licences.

[No. DCCI&E/H-15/AM-75/FNF/BNR/AU/KAN]
D. S. MORKRIMA, Dy. Chief Controller

संयुक्त मुख्य निर्यातक, आयात-निर्यात का कार्यालय

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 28 अप्रैल, 1976

का० प्रा० 2598.—सर्वश्री प्रेमचन्द एण्ड सन्स, 13/31, डब्ल्यू-ई-ए कारोल बाग नई दिल्ली को केवल मिनेमा और प्रशीतन से अन्य और कम से 65 (1-4) (7) (क) और (ख) भाग 3 के अन्तर्गत आने वाले मशीनरी के फायल पुर्जों से भी भिन्न उद्योगों के लिए जब आवश्यकता हो मशीनरी के पुर्जों का आयात करने के लिए 1250 रुपये मात्र के लिए संस्थापित आयातक ला० सं० पी०/ई/0222195/सी/एक्स एक्स/47/डी/37-38 दि० 28-5-73 प्रदान किया गया था। उन्होंने लाइसेंस की मुद्रा विनियम नियन्त्रण प्रति की अनुलिपि के लिए इस आधार पर आवेदन किया है कि मूल प्रति खो गई है/ अस्थानस्थ हो गई है। कर्म द्वारा प्राप्ति यह भी बताया गया है कि ला० की मूल मुद्रा विनियम नियन्त्रण प्रति अप्रैल/मार्च-74 की अवधि के दौरान 1250 रुपये के लिए उपयोग कर ली गई है।

इस घोषणा के समर्थन में आवेदक ने यह घताने हुए कि ला० की मूल मुद्रा विनियम नियन्त्रण प्रति खो गई / अस्थानस्थ हो गई है, त्रिधित सांख्यिकीय एक शपथ पत्र दाखिल किया है।

मैं सन्तुष्ट हूँ कि ला० की मूल मुद्रा विनियम नियन्त्रण प्रति खो गई है और निदेश देता हूँ कि आवेदक को मुद्रा विनियम नियन्त्रण प्रति की अनुलिपि जारी की जानी चाहिए। ला० की मूल मुद्रा विनियम नियन्त्रण प्रति रद्द की जाती है।

आवेदक को अब 1250 रुपये के लिए उपर्युक्त ला० की मुद्रा विनियम नियन्त्रण प्रति की अनुलिपि जारी की जा रही है जो उन्हें अप्रैल-मार्च, 1975 की लाइसेंस अवधि के लिए पुनः परिवर्तन के मद्दे सम्भरकों को प्रेषण करने के प्रयोजन के लिए चाहिए।

[नि० संख्या 85-5/6/ए-एम०-74/क्यू-एल/सी० एल० ए.]

डी० पी० माथुर, उप मुख्य निर्यातक
उत्ते मुख्य निर्यातक

Office of the Joint Chief Controller of Imports & Exports
ORDER

New Delhi, the 28th April, 1976

S.O. 2598.—M/s. Premchand & Sons, 13/31, W.E.A. Karol Bagh, New Delhi were granted Established Importers

licence No. P/E/0222195/C/XX/47/D/37-38 dated 28-5-73 for Rs. 1250/- only for the import of "Parts of Machinery when required for Industries other than cinema and Refrigeration and also other than spare parts of Machinery falling under S. No. 65(1-4) (VII) (A) and (B) Part V". They have applied for the duplicate Exchange Control Copy of the licence on the ground that the original has been lost or misplaced. It is, further stated by the firm that the original Exchange Control Copy of the licence was utilised for Rs. 1250 during the period A-M' 74.

In support of this declaration the applicant has filed an affidavit duly attested stating that the original Exchange Control Copy of the licence has been lost or misplaced.

I am satisfied that the original Exchange Control Copy of the licence has been lost and direct that duplicate Exchange Control Copy should be issued to the applicant. The original Exchange Control Copy of the licence is cancelled.

The applicant is now being issued duplicate Exchange Purpose Copy of aforesaid licence for Rs. 1250 required by them for the purpose of remittance to the suppliers against repeat operation of A-M' 75 licencing period.

[F. No. 65-V/6/AM-74/QL/CLA]
D. P. MATHUR, Dy. Chief Controller
for Chief Controller.

उपमुख्य निर्यातक, आयात-निर्यात का कार्यालय

आदेश

फरीदाबाद, 28 जून, 1976

का० प्रा० 2599.—पंजीकरण का पतन, बम्बई के साथ यू० के० क्रेडिट के अन्तर्गत सर्वश्री रीगल आयरन वर्क्स 2185-पहाड़ी बोझला जिला कबूर, दिल्ली को 0.95 प्रतिशत से 1.30 प्रतिशत तक कारबन वाली और 2.5 एम एम से 0.08 एम एम तक मोटाई से सबल की हुई तथा कठोर अवस्था में प्राप्त हुई कार्बन स्प्रिंग स्टीम का आयात करने के लिए 2,500 रुपये के लिए आयात लाइसेंस संख्या पी/एम/8560468/आर/एम०एल/41/डी/31-32 एम० एल-1, दिनांक 20-10-71 प्रदान किया गया था। उन्होंने बताया है कि सीमाशुल्क निकासी प्रयोजन प्रति खो गई है।

इस तर्क के समर्थन में आवेदक ने एक शपथ-पत्र दाखिल किया है। मैं सन्तुष्ट हूँ कि लाइसेंस संख्या पी/एम/8560468/आर/एम एल/41/डी/31-32 एम० एल०-1, दिनांक 20-10-71 की मूल सीमाशुल्क निकासी प्रयोजन प्रति खो गई है।

[संख्या आर० 14/ए०एम०/73/ई० एक्स०/ए० यू० डी०/डी० सी० सी० एफ०]

डी० एन० सिंह, निर्यातक

Office of the Dy. Chief Controller of Imports and Exports
ORDER

नई दिल्ली, 29 जून, 1976

Landabad, the 28th June, 1976

S.O. 2599.—M/s. Regal Iron Works 2185-Pahari Bhojla Chitli qabar, Delhi were granted an Import Licence No. P/S/8560468/R/ML/41/D/31-32 MLI dated 20-10-1971 for the item prime high carbon spring steel strips with carbon range from 0.95 per cent to 1.30 per cent and thickness ranging from 2.5 mm to 0.08 mm in hardened and tempered condition for Rs. 2,500/- under U.K. Credit for April-March, 1971 with the port of registration Bombay. They have stated that the Custom clearance purpose copy of the licence has been lost.

In support of this contention, the applicant has filed an affidavit. I am satisfied that the original Custom clearance purpose copy of the licence No. P/S/8560468/R/ML/41/D/31-32 MLI dated 20-10-1971 has been lost.

[No. R. 14/AM/73/EX/AUD/DCCF]
B. N. SINGH, Controller.

उद्योग और नागरिक पूर्ति मंत्रालय

(नागरिक पूर्ति और सहकारिता विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 26 जून, 1976

का० आ० 2600.—व्यापार और पण्य चिन्ह, नियम, 1959 के नियम 157 के उप नियम (2) के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार, एतद्वारा व्यापार चिन्ह अधिकर्ता के रजिस्टर में बम्बई के पंजीकृत व्यापार चिन्ह अधिकर्ता श्री ए० टी० भगत के कारबार के स्थान के पते में किए गए निम्नलिखित परिवर्तन की अधिसूचित करती है :

कारबार का स्थान : अर्जुन टी० भगत,
ट्रेड मार्क्स एंड पेटेंट्स अटार्नीज,
116/11, देसाई मार्केट,
मोदी स्ट्रीट, फोर्ट बम्बई-400001
तथा
125, लक्ष्मी सदान पाइप रोड,
कुला, बम्बई-400070

[फ० न० 29(9)-आई०टी०/टी०एम/76]

MINISTRY OF INDUSTRY & CIVIL SUPPLIES

(Department of Civil Supplies & Cooperation)

New Delhi, the 26th June, 1976

S.O. 2600.—In pursuance of sub-rule (2) of Rule 157 of the Trade and Merchandise Marks Rules, 1959, the Central Government hereby notifies the following alterations made in the Register of Trade Marks Agents in the address of the place of business of Shri A. T. Bhagat, a Registered Trade Marks Agent, Bombay :

Place of business :

ARJUN T. BHAGAT,
Trade Marks & Patents
Attorney,
116/11, Desai Market,
Modi Street, Fort,
Bombay-400001.
and also
125 Laxmi Sadan Pipe Road,
Kurla, Bombay-400070

[F. No. 29(9)-IT/TM/76]

का० आ० 2601.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, अधिम सविदा (अभिनियम) अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 74) की धारा 5 के अधीन बनस्पाति मैन्युफैक्चर्स एसोसिएशन आफ इण्डिया, बम्बई द्वारा मान्यता के नवीकरण के लिए किये गये आवेदन पर बायदा बाजार आयोग के परामर्श से विचार करके और यह समाधान हो जाने पर कि ऐसा करना व्यापार के हित में और लोकहित में भी होगा, एतद्वारा उक्त अधिनियम, की धारा 6 के द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, उक्त एसोसिएशन को मंगसली के लेल की अधिम सविदाओं के बारे में, 10 अगस्त, 1976 से 9 अगस्त, 1977 (जिसमें ये दोनों दिन भी सम्मिलित हैं) की एक वर्ष की अतिरिक्त कालावधि के लिए मान्यता प्रदान करती है।

2. एतद्वारा प्रदत्त मान्यता इस शर्त के अधीन है कि उक्त एसोसिएशन ऐसे निदेशों का अनुपालन करेगी जो बायदा बाजार आयोग द्वारा समय-समय पर दिए जाएं।

[स० 12(11)-आई०टी०/76]

बी० एन० लाल, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 29th June, 1976

S.O. 2601.—The Central Government having considered in consultation with the Forward Markets Commission, the application for renewal of recognition made under Section 5 of the Forward Contracts (Regulation) Act, 1952. (74 of 1952), by the Vanuspati Manufacturers' Association of India, Bombay, and being satisfied that it would be in the interest of the trade and also in the public interest so to do, hereby grants, in exercise of the powers conferred by the Section 6 of the said Act, recognition to the said Association for a further period of one year from the 10th August, 1976 to the 9th August, 1977 (both days inclusive) in respect of forward contracts in groundnut oil.

2. The recognition hereby granted is subject to the condition that the said Association shall comply with such directions as may, from time to time, be given by the Forward Markets Commission.

[F. No. 12(11)-IT/76]

B. N. LALL, Under Secy.

रसायन और उर्वरक मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 5 जून, 1976

का० आ० 2602.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, सरकारी स्थान (अप्राधिकृत अधिमोगियों की बेदखली) अधिनियम, 1971 (1971 का 40) की धारा 3 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, और भारत सरकार के पेट्रोलियम और रसायन मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना न० का० आ० 1563 तारीख 31 मई, 1974 की अधिकात करते हुए, नीचे की सारणी के स्तम्भ (1) में उल्लिखित अधिकारी को, जो सरकार के राजपत्रित अधिकारी की पंक्ति के समतुल्य अधिकारी है, उक्त अधिनियम के प्रयोजनों के लिये सम्पदा अधिकारी के रूप में नियुक्त करती है, जो उक्त सारणी के स्तम्भ (2) में विनिर्दिष्ट सरकारी स्थानों की वाबन अपनी अधिकारिता की स्थानीय सीमाओं के भीतर उक्त अधिनियम द्वारा या उसके अधीन सम्पदा अधिकारियों को प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करेगा और उन पर अधिग्रहित कर्तव्यों का पालन करेगा।

| सारणी | अनुसूची |
|---|---|
| अधिकारी का पदाभिधान | सरकारी स्थानों के प्रवर्ग और अधिकारिता की स्थानीय सीमाएँ |
| 1 | 2 |
| ज्येष्ठ प्रशासन अधिकारी, बरौनी, डिबीजन (बिहार), भारतीय उर्वरक निगम, बरौनी | बरौनी कारखाने और उसके उपनगर के लिये भारतीय उर्वरक निगम लिमिटेड के या उसके द्वारा या उसकी ओर से पट्टे पर लिये गये स्थान। |

[सं० एफ० 51(53)/73-उर्ब० 2]

टी० एन० सिंगल, अवसर सचिव

MINISTRY OF CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS

New Delhi, the 5th June, 1976

S. O. 2602.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 3 of the Public Premises (Eviction of Unauthorised Occupants) Act, 1971 (40 of 1971), and in supersession of the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Petroleum and Chemicals No. S.O. 1563 dated the 31st May, 1974, the Central Government hereby appoints the officer mentioned in column (1) of the Table below, being an officer equivalent to the rank of gazetted officer of Government, to be estate officer for the purposes of the said Act, who shall exercise the powers conferred, and perform the duties imposed, on estate officers by or under the said Act within the local limits of his jurisdiction in respect of the public premises specified in column (2) of the said Table.

TABLE

| Designation of the Officer (1) | Categories of Public premises and local limits of jurisdiction (2) |
|---|---|
| Senior Administrative Officer Barauni Division, (Bihar), Fertilizer Corporation of India, Barauni. | Premises belonging to, or taken on lease by or on behalf of, the FCI, Ltd. for the Barauni Factory and its township. |

[No. F. 51(53)/73-Ferts. II]
T. N. SINGHAL, Under Secy.

पेट्रोलियम मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 24 जून, 1976

का० आ० 2603.—यतः इस संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट और पेट्रोलियम पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकारों का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन प्रकाशित भारत सरकार की अधिसूचना द्वारा गुजरात राज्य के मेहसाना तेल क्षेत्र में व्यधन क्षेत्र नं० एन० के०-61 से जी जी एस/सी टी एफ कादीक पेट्रोलियम के परिवहन के लिए उस संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमियों के उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जन कर लिया है।

और यतः तेल और प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग ने 11-10-74 को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (1) में निर्दिष्ट प्रक्रिया को पर्यवसित कर दिया है।

अब अतः पेट्रोलियम पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकारों का अर्जन) नियमावली 1963 के नियम 4 के अधीन सक्षम प्राधिकारी उक्त तारीख को ऊपर निर्दिष्ट संक्रिया के पर्यवसान के रूप में एतद्द्वारा अधिसूचित करता है।

| मंत्रालय का नाम | गांव | सर्वेक्षण संख्या | भारत के राजपत्र के प्रकाशन की तारीख | संक्रिया के पर्यवसान की तारीख |
|-----------------|-------|------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| पेट्रोलियम | चालसन | 1824 | 14-6-75 | 11-10-74 |

[सं० 12016/1/76-एल० एण्ड एल० 1]

MINISTRY OF PETROLEUM

New Delhi, the 24th June, 1976

S.O. 2603.—Whereas by the notification of Government of India as shown in the schedule appended hereto and issued under sub section (i) of section 6 of the Petroleum Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in land) Act, 1962 the Right of User has been acquired in the lands specified in the schedule appended thereto for the transport of Petroleum from drill site No. NK-61 to GGS/CTF Kadi in Mahsana oil field in Gujarat State.

And whereas the Oil & Natural Gas Commission has terminated the operations referred to in clause (i) of sub-section (1) of section 7 of the said Act on 11-10-74.

Now therefore under Rule 4 of the Petroleum Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in land) Rules, 1963, the Competent Authority hereby notified the said date as the date of termination of operation referred to above.

SCHEDULE

Termination of Operation of Pipeline from D.S. NK-61 to GGS/CTF Kadi

| Name of Ministry | Village | S.O. No. | Date of publication in the Gazette of India | Date of termination of operation |
|------------------|----------|----------|---|----------------------------------|
| Petroleum | Chalasan | 1824 | 14-6-75 | 11-10-74 |

[No. 12016/1/76-L&L/I]

का० आ० 2604.—यतः इस संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट और पेट्रोलियम पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकारों का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन प्रकाशित भारत सरकार की अधिसूचना द्वारा गुजरात राज्य के मेहसाना तेल क्षेत्र में व्यधन क्षेत्र नं० कादी 12 से जी जी एस तक पेट्रोलियम के परिवहन के लिए उस संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमियों के उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जन कर लिया है।

और यतः तेल और प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग ने 3-10-74 को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (1) में निर्दिष्ट प्रक्रिया को पर्यवसित कर दिया है।

अब अतः पेट्रोलियम पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकारों का अर्जन) नियमावली 1963 के नियम 4 के अधीन सक्षम प्राधिकारी उक्त तारीख को ऊपर निर्दिष्ट संक्रिया के पर्यवसान के रूप में एतद्द्वारा अधिसूचित करता है।

अनुसूची

जी एस—से—पाइपलाइन की सक्रियता का पर्यवेक्षण

| मंत्रालय का नाम | गांव | सर्वेक्षण संख्या | भारत के राजपत्र के प्रकाशन की तारीख | सक्रियता के पर्यवेक्षण की तारीख |
|-----------------|------|------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| पेट्रोलियम | कादी | 958 | 29-3-75 | 3-10-74 |

[संख्या 12016/1/76-एस एण्ड एल/II]

S.O. 2604.—Whereas by the notification of Government of India as shown in the schedule appended hereto and issued under sub-section (i) of Section 6 of the Petroleum Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in land) Act, 1962 the Right of User has been acquired in the lands specified in the schedule appended thereto for the transport of Petroleum from drill site No. Kadi-12 to GGS in Mehsana oil field in Gujarat State.

And whereas the Oil & Natural Gas Commission has terminated the operations referred to in clause (i) of sub-section (1) of section 7 of the said Act on 3-10-74.

Now therefore under Rule 4 of the Petroleum Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in land) Rules, 1963, the Competent Authority hereby notified the said date as the date of termination of operation referred to above.

SCHEDULE

Termination of operation of Pipeline from... to...

| Name of Ministry | Village | S.O. No. | Date of publication in the Gazette of India. | Date of termination of operation |
|------------------|---------|----------|--|----------------------------------|
| Petroleum | Kadi | 958 | 29-3-75 | 3-10-74 |

[No. 12016/1/76-L & L-II]

का० आ० 2605.—यतः इस संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट और पेट्रोलियम पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकारों का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन प्रकाशित भारत सरकार की अधिसूचना द्वारा गुजरात राज्य के तेल क्षेत्र में व्यधन क्षेत्र एन० के० 70 से जी जी एस और सी टी एफ कादी तक पेट्रोलियम के परिवहन के लिए उस संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमियों के उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित कर लिया है।

और यतः तेल और प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग ने 30-9-74 को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (1) में निदिष्ट प्रक्रिया को पर्यवेक्षित कर दिया है।

अब अतः पेट्रोलियम पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकारों का अर्जन) नियमावली, 1963 के नियम 4 के अधीन सक्षम प्राधिकारी उक्त तारीख को ऊपर निदिष्ट सक्रियता के पर्यवेक्षण के रूप में एतद्वारा अधिसूचित करता है।

अनुसूची

जी एस एन के 70 से जी जी एस और सी टी एफ कादी तक पाइपलाइन सक्रियता का पर्यवेक्षण

| मंत्रालय का नाम | गांव | सर्वेक्षण संख्या | भारत के राजपत्र के प्रकाशन की तारीख | सक्रियता के पर्यवेक्षण की तारीख |
|-----------------|-------|------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| पेट्रोलियम | चलासन | 2205 | 12-7-75 | 30-9-74 |

[सं० 12016/1/76-एस एण्ड एल/III]

S.O. 2603.—Whereas by the notification of Government of India as shown in the schedule appended hereto and issued under sub-section (i) of Section 6 of the Petroleum Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in land) Act, 1962 the Right of User has been acquired in the lands specified in the schedule appended thereto for the transport of Petroleum from drill site No. NK-70 to G.G.S.-Cum CTF, kadi in oil field in Gujarat State.

And whereas the Oil & Natural Gas Commission has terminated the operations referred to in clause (i) of sub-section (1) of Section 7 of the said Act on 30-9-74.

Now therefore under Rule 4 of the Petroleum Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in land) Rules, 1963, the Competent Authority hereby notified the said date as the date of termination of operation referred to above.

SCHEDULE

Termination of operation of Pipeline from D.S. NK-70 to GGS-cum-CTF, Kadi

| Name of Ministry | Village | S.O. No. | Date of publication in the Gazette of India | Date of termination of operation |
|------------------|----------|----------|---|----------------------------------|
| Petroleum | Chalasan | 2205 | 12-7-75 | 30-9-74 |

[No. 12016/1/76-L&L/III]

का० आ० 2606.—यतः इस संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट और पेट्रोलियम पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकारों का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन प्रकाशित भारत सरकार की अधिसूचना द्वारा गुजरात राज्य के मेहसाना तेल क्षेत्र में व्यधन क्षेत्र एन० के० 66 से जी जी एस तक पेट्रोलियम के परिवहन के लिए उस संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमियों के उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित कर लिया है।

और यतः तेल और प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग ने 20-12-74 को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (1) में निदिष्ट प्रक्रिया को पर्यवेक्षित कर दिया है।

अब अतः पेट्रोलियम पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकारों का अर्जन) नियमावली, 1963 के नियम 4 के अधीन सक्षम प्राधिकारी उक्त तारीख को ऊपर निदिष्ट सक्रियता के पर्यवेक्षण के रूप में एतद्वारा अधिसूचित करता है।

अनुसूची

एन० के० 66 से जी जी एस तक पाइपलाइन की सक्रियता का पर्यवेक्षण

| मंत्रालय का नाम | गांव | सर्वेक्षण संख्या | भारत के राजपत्र के प्रकाशन की तारीख | सक्रियता के पर्यवेक्षण की तारीख |
|-----------------|--------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| पेट्रोलियम | मेवेपुरा और बालासन | 2760 | 23-8-75 | 20-12-74 |

[सं० 12016/1/76-एस एण्ड एल/IV]

S.O. 2606.—Whereas by the notification of Government of India as shown in the schedule appended hereto and issued under sub-section (i) of Section 6 of the Petroleum Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in land) Act, 1962 the Right of User has been acquired in the lands specified in the schedule appended thereto for the transport of Petroleum from drill site No. NK-66 to G.G.S. in Mehsana oil field in Gujarat State.

And whereas the Oil & Natural Gas Commission has terminated the operations referred to in clause (i) of sub section (1) of section 7 of the said Act on 20-12-74.

Now therefore under Rule 4 of the Petroleum Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in land) Rules 1963, the Competent Authority hereby notified the said date as the date of termination of operation referred to above.

SCHEDULE

Termination of operation of pipeline from NK-66 to G.G.S.

| Name of Ministry | Village | S.O. No. | Date of publication in the gazette of India. | Date of termination of operation. |
|------------------|----------------------|----------|--|-----------------------------------|
| Petroleum | Memadpura & Balsasan | 2760 | 23-8-75 | 20-12-74 |

[No. 12016/1/76-L&L/IV]

का० आ० 2607.—यतः इस संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट और पेट्रोलियम पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकारों का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन प्रकाशित भारत सरकार की अधिसूचना द्वारा गुजरात राज्य के मेहसाना तेल क्षेत्र में व्यधन क्षेत्र सख्या एन के 54 से जी जी एम/सी टी एफ कादी तक पेट्रोलियम के परिवहन के लिए उस संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमियों के उपयोग का अधिकार अंशित कर लिया है।

और यतः तेल और प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग ने 6-10-74 को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (1) में निर्दिष्ट प्रक्रिया को पर्यवसित कर दिया है।

अब अतः पेट्रोलियम पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकारों का अर्जन) नियमावली 1963 के नियम 4 के अधीन सक्षम प्राधिकारी उक्त तारीख को ऊपर निर्दिष्ट सक्रिया के पर्यवसान के रूप में एमद्वारा अधिसूचित करता है।

अनुसूची

डी एस एन के-54 से जी जी एम/सी टी एफ कादी तक पाइपलाइन की सक्रिया का पर्यवसान

| मंत्रालय का नाम | गांव | सर्वेक्षण संख्या | भारत के राजपत्र के प्रकाशन की तारीख | सक्रिया के पर्यवसान की तारीख |
|-----------------|-------|------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| पेट्रोलियम | बलामन | 1823 | 14-6-75 | 6-10-74 |

[सं० 12016/1/76-एन एण्ड एल/VI]

S.O. 2607—Whereas by the notification of Government of India as shown in the schedule appended hereto and issued under sub section (i) of section 6 of the Petroleum Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in land) Act, 1962 the Right of User has been acquired in the lands specified in the schedule appended thereto for the transport of Petroleum from drill site No. NK-54 to GGS/CTF, Kadi in Mehsana oil field in Gujarat State.

And whereas the Oil & Natural Gas Commission has terminated the operations referred to in clause (i) of sub-section (1) of section 7 of the said Act on 6-10-74.

Now therefore under Rule 4 of the Petroleum Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in land) Rules 1963, the Competent Authority hereby notified the said date as the date of termination of operation referred to above.

SCHEDULE

Termination of operation of pipeline from D.S.to ..

| Name of Ministry | Village | S.O. No. | Date of publication in the Gazette of India | Date of termination of operation |
|------------------|----------|----------|---|----------------------------------|
| Petroleum | Chalasan | 1823 | 14-6-75 | 6-10-74 |

[No. 12016/1/76-L&L/IV]

का० आ० 2608.—यतः इस संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट और पेट्रोलियम पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकारों का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन प्रकाशित भारत सरकार की अधिसूचना द्वारा गुजरात राज्य के मेहसाना तेल क्षेत्र में व्यधन क्षेत्र न० मेहसाना-2 से डब्ल्यू एच आई तक पेट्रोलियम के परिवहन के लिए उस संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमियों के उपयोग का अधिकार अंशित कर लिया है।

और यतः तेल और प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग ने 28-3-75 को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (1) में निर्दिष्ट प्रक्रिया को पर्यवसित कर दिया है।

अब अतः पेट्रोलियम पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकारों का अर्जन) नियमावली 1963 के नियम 4 के अधीन सक्षम प्राधिकारी उक्त तारीख को ऊपर निर्दिष्ट सक्रिया के पर्यवसान के रूप में एमद्वारा अधिसूचित करता है।

अनुसूची

डी एस मेहसाना 2 से डब्ल्यू एच आई तक पाइपलाइन की सक्रिया का पर्यवसान

| मंत्रालय का नाम | गांव | सर्वेक्षण संख्या | भारत के राजपत्र के प्रकाशन की तारीख | सक्रिया के पर्यवसान की तारीख |
|-----------------|-------|------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| पेट्रोलियम | अलोडा | 2011 | 10-8-74 | 28-3-75 |

[संख्या 12016/1/76-एन एण्ड एल/VI]

S.O. 2608.—Whereas by the notification of Government of India as shown in the schedule appended hereto and issued under sub section (i) of section 6 of the Petroleum Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in land) Act, 1962 the Right of User has been acquired in the lands specified in the schedule appended thereto for the transport of Petroleum from drill site No. Mehsana-2 to W.H.I. in Mehsana oil field in Gujarat State.

And whereas the Oil & Natural Gas Commission has terminated the operations referred to in clause (i) of sub section (1) of section 7 of the said Act on 28-3-75.

Now therefore under Rule 4 of the Petroleum Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in land) Rules 1963, the Competent Authority hereby notified the said date as the date of termination of operation referred to above.

SCHEDULE

Termination of operation of pipeline from D.S. Mehsana-2 to W.H.I.

| Name of Ministry | Village | S.O. No. | Date of publication in the Gazette of India | Date of termination of operation |
|------------------|---------|----------|---|----------------------------------|
| Petroleum | Aloda | 2011 | 10-8-74 | 28-3-75 |

[No. 12016/1/76-L&L/VI]

क्रा० आ० 2609.—यत् इस संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट और पेट्रोलियम पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकारों का अर्जन) अधिनियम 1962 की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन प्रकाशित भारत सरकार की अधिसूचना द्वारा गुजरात राज्य के तेल क्षेत्र में स्थित क्षेत्र न डब्ल्यू एच आई कादी-4 में जी जी एस तक पेट्रोलियम के परिवहन के लिए उस संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमियों के उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित कर लिया है।

और यत् तेल और प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग ने 3-10-74 को उक्त अधिनियम को धारा 7 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (1) में निर्दिष्ट प्रक्रिया को पर्यवेक्षण कर दिया है।

अब अतः पेट्रोलियम पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकारों का अर्जन) नियमावली 1963 के नियम 4 के अधीन सक्षम प्राधिकारी उक्त तारीख को ऊपर निर्दिष्ट सक्रिया के पर्यावर्तमान के रूप में एतद् द्वारा अधिसूचित करता है।

अनुसूची

मे. तक पाइपलाइन की सक्रिया का पर्यावर्तमान

| संस्थान का नाम | गांव | सर्वेक्षण संख्या | भारत के राजपत्र के प्रकाशन की तारीख | सक्रिया के पर्यवेक्षण की तारीख |
|----------------|------|------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| पेट्रोलियम | कादी | 1546 | 17-5-75 | 3-10-74 |

[सं० 12016/1/76-एल एण्ड एल/VII]

के० वी० देशपाण्डे, सक्षम प्राधिकारी

S. O. 2609.—Whereas by the notification of Government of India as shown in the schedule appended hereto and issued under sub section (i) of section 6 of the Petroleum Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in land) Act, 1962 the Right of User has been acquired in the lands specified in the schedule appended thereto for the transport of Petroleum from drill site No. W.H.I. Kadi-4 to G.G.S. in..... oil field in Gujarat State.

And whereas the Oil & Natural Gas Commission has terminated the operations referred to in clause (i) of sub section (1) of section 7 of the said act on 31-10-74.

Now, therefore, under Rule 4 of the Petroleum Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in land) Rules 1963, the Competent Authority hereby notified the said date as the date of termination of operation referred to above.

SCHEDULE

Termination of operation of pipeline from..... to.....

| Name of Ministry | Village | S.O. No. | Date of publication in the Gazette of India | Date of termination of operation |
|------------------|---------|----------|---|----------------------------------|
| Petroleum | Kadi | 1546 | 17-5-75 | 3-10-74 |

[No. 12016/1/76-L&L/VII]

K.V. , DESHPANDE, Competent Authority

क्रा० आ० 2510.—यत् पेट्रोलियम, पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकारों का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन भारत सरकार के पेट्रोलियम और रसायन मंत्रालय (पेट्रोलियम- विभाग) की अधिसूचना क्र० आ० सं० 525, तारीख 8-1-76 द्वारा केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उस अधिसूचना में संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमियों के उपयोग के अधिकार को पाइपलाइनों को बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिये अर्जित करने का अपना आणख घोषित कर दिया था।

और यत् सक्षम प्राधिकारी के उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन सरकार को रिपोर्ट दे दी है।

और आगे, यत् केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उक्त रिपोर्ट पर विचार करने के पश्चात् इस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमियों में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का विनिश्चय किया है।

अब, अतः उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्ति का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्द्वारा घोषित करती है कि इस अधिसूचना में संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट उक्त भूमियों में उपयोग का अधिकार पाइपलाइन बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिये एतद् द्वारा अर्जित किया जाता है।

और, आगे उस धारा की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार निदेश देती है कि उक्त भूमियों में उपयोग का अधिकार केन्द्रीय सरकार में विहित होने के बजाय तेल और प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग में, सभी संश्लेषों से मुक्त रूप में, इस घोषणा के प्रकाशन की इस तारीख को निहित होगा।

अनुसूची

क्रा० सं० 79,62 से जी जी एस-वन्सी टी एफ कादी तक आर ओ यू का अधिवहन

| राज्य : गुजरात | जिला : मेहसना | तालुका : कादी | | |
|----------------|---------------|---------------|-----------|----------|
| गांव | सर्वेक्षण सं० | हैक्टर | ए. आर. ई. | सेन्टीयर |
| बलासन | 93 | 0 | 02 | 00 |
| | 69 | 0 | 09 | 50 |
| | 65 | 0 | 22 | 50 |
| | 64 | 0 | 15 | 75 |
| | 59/1 | 0 | 03 | 50 |
| | 60 | 0 | 03 | 50 |
| | 54 | 0 | 15 | 75 |
| | 53 | 0 | 27 | 50 |
| | 25 | 0 | 19 | 00 |
| | 42 | 0 | 02 | 00 |
| | 64/1 | 0 | 08 | 75 |
| | 64/2 | 0 | 07 | 00 |

[सं० 12016/7/75-एल एण्ड एल]

S.O. 2610.—Whereas by a notification of the Govt. of India in the Ministry of Petroleum & Chemicals (Department of Petroleum) S.O. No. 525 dated, 8-1-76 under sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government declared its intention to acquire the Right of User in the lands specified in the schedule appended to that notification for the purpose of laying pipelines.

And whereas the Competent Authority has under sub-section (1) of section 6 of the said Act, submitted report to the Government.

And further whereas the Central Government has after considering the said report, decided to acquire the Right of User in the lands specified in the schedule appended to this notification

Now therefore in exercise of the power conferred by sub-section (1) of the section 6 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby declares that the right of user in the said lands specified in the schedule appended to this notification hereby acquired for laying the pipelines.

And further in exercise of the power conferred by sub-section (4) of that Section, the Central Government directs that the right of user in the said lands shall instead of vesting in the Central Government vest on this date of the publication of this declaration in the Oil & Natural Gas Commission free from all encumbrances.

SCHEDULE

Acquisition of R.O.U. from well No. 79, 62 to GGS-cum-CTF Kadi.

| State : Gujarat | District : Mehsana | Taluka : Kadi | | | |
|-----------------|--------------------|---------------|-----|-----------|--|
| Village | Survey No. | Hec-tare | Are | Cen-tiare | |
| Chalasan | 93 | 0 | 02 | 00 | |
| | 69 | 0 | 09 | 50 | |
| | 65 | 0 | 22 | 50 | |
| | 64 | 0 | 15 | 75 | |
| | 59/1 | 0 | 03 | 50 | |
| | 60 | 0 | 03 | 50 | |
| | 54 | 0 | 15 | 75 | |
| | 53 | 0 | 27 | 50 | |
| | 25 | 0 | 19 | 00 | |
| | 42 | 0 | 02 | 00 | |
| | 64/1 | 0 | 08 | 75 | |
| | 64/2 | 0 | 07 | 00 | |

[No. 12016/75-L&L]

का० आ० 2611.—यतः पेट्रोलियम, पाइपलाइन (भूमि के उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन भारत सरकार के पेट्रोलियम और रसायन मंत्रालय (पेट्रोलियम विभाग) की अधिसूचना का० आ० सं० 526, तारीख 8-1-76 द्वारा केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमियों के उपयोग के अधिकार को पाइपलाइनों को बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए अर्जित करने का अपना आशय घोषित कर दिया था।

और यतः सभ्य प्राधिकारी के उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन सरकार को रिपोर्ट दे दी है।

और आगे, यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उक्त रिपोर्ट पर विचार करने के पश्चात् इस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमियों में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का विनिश्चय किया है।

अब, धनः उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्ति का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा घोषित करती है कि इस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट उक्त भूमियों में उपयोग का अधिकार पाइपलाइन बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिये एतद्वारा अर्जित किया जाता है।

और, आगे उस धारा की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार निदेश देती है कि उक्त भूमियों में उपयोग का अधिकार केन्द्रीय सरकार में विहित होने के बजाय तेल और प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग में, सभी सभ्यको से मुक्त रूप में, इस घोषणा के प्रकाशन की इस तारीख को निहित होगा।

अनुसूची

कादी-22 से कादी-4 तक पाइपलाइन

| राज्य गुजरात | जिला : मेहसाना | तालुका : | कादी | | |
|--------------|----------------|----------|-----------|----------|--|
| गांव | सर्वेक्षण नं० | हेक्टेयर | ए. आर. ई. | सेण्टीयर | |
| एसडासन | 113/1 | 0 | 08 | 94 | |
| | 125 | 0 | 00 | 50 | |
| | 126 | 0 | 05 | 12 | |
| कादी | 60/3 | 0 | 08 | 17 | |
| | 60/वी | 0 | 09 | 88 | |
| | 59 | 0 | 20 | 99 | |
| | 47 | 0 | 05 | 00 | |
| | 28 | 0 | 07 | 56 | |
| | 29 | 0 | 05 | 75 | |
| | 31 | 0 | 05 | 12 | |
| | 32 | 0 | 04 | 88 | |
| | 38 | 0 | 02 | 56 | |
| | 37 | 0 | 06 | 35 | |
| | 35 | 0 | 05 | 50 | |
| | 36 | 0 | 15 | 52 | |
| | 17/3/वी | 0 | 05 | 85 | |
| | 17/3 | 0 | 02 | 82 | |
| | काटेडूक | 0 | 02 | 20 | |
| | 15 | 0 | 13 | 06 | |
| | 14 | 0 | 01 | 50 | |
| | 13 | 0 | 03 | 66 | |

[सं० 12016/7/76-एल एण्ड एल(II)]

S.O. 2611.—Whereas by a notification of the Govt. of India in the Ministry of Petroleum & Chemicals (Department of Petroleum) S.O. No. 526 dated 8-1-76 under sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962); the Central Government declared its intention to acquire the Right of User in the lands specified in the schedule appended to that notification for the purpose of laying pipelines.

And whereas the Competent Authority has under sub-section (1) of section 6 of the said Act, submitted report to the Government.

And further whereas the Central Government has after considering the said report, decided to acquire the Right of User in the lands specified in the schedule appended to this notification;

Now therefore in exercise of the power conferred by sub-section 1 of the section 6 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby declares that the right of user in the said lands specified in the schedule appended to this notification hereby acquired for laying the pipelines.

And further in exercise of the power conferred by sub-section (4) of that Section, the Central Government directs that the right of user in the said lands shall instead of vesting in the Central Government vest on this date of the publication of this declaration in the Oil & Natural Gas Commission free from all encumbrances.

SCHEDULE

| Pipeline from Kadi-22 to Kadi-4. State : Gujarat District : Mehsana Taluka : Kadi | | | | |
|--|------------|--------------|-----|-----------------|
| Village | Survey No. | Hec- tare | Are | Centi- tiare |
| Aldasan | 113/1 | 0 | 08 | 94 |
| | 125 | 0 | 00 | 50 |
| | 126 | 0 | 05 | 12 |
| | 60/3 | 0 | 03 | 17 |
| Kadi | 60/P | 0 | 09 | 88 |
| | 59 | 0 | 20 | 99 |
| | 47 | 0 | 05 | 00 |
| | 28 | 0 | 07 | 56 |
| | 29 | 0 | 05 | 75 |
| | 31 | 0 | 05 | 12 |
| | 32 | 0 | 04 | 88 |
| | 38 | 0 | 02 | 56 |
| | 37 | 0 | 06 | 35 |
| | 35 | 0 | 05 | 50 |
| | 36 | 0 | 15 | 52 |
| | 17/3/P | 0 | 05 | 85 |
| | 17/3 | 0 | 02 | 82 |
| | Cart track | 0 | 02 | 20 |
| | 15 | 0 | 13 | 06 |
| | 14 | 0 | 01 | 50 |
| | 13 | 0 | 03 | 66 |

[No. 12016/7/76-L&L]

का० आ० 2612.—यतः पेट्रोलियम, पाइपलाइन (भूमि के उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन भारत सरकार के पेट्रोलियम और रसायन मंत्रालय (पेट्रोलियम विभाग) की अधिसूचना का० आ० सं० 5079 तारीख 13-11-75 द्वारा केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमियों के उपयोग के अधिकार का पाइपलाइन को बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिये अर्जित करने का अपना आग्रह घोषित कर दिया था।

और यतः महाम प्राधिकारी ने उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन सरकार को रिपोर्ट दे दी है।

और आगे, यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उक्त रिपोर्ट पर विचार करने के पश्चात् इस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमियों में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का विनिश्चय किया है।

अब, अतः उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्ति का प्रयोग करते हुये, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा घोषित करती है कि इस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट उक्त भूमियों में उपयोग का अधिकार पाइपलाइन बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए एतद्वारा अर्जित किया जाता है।

और, आगे उस धारा की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुये केन्द्रीय सरकार निदेश देती है कि उक्त भूमियों में उपयोग का अधिकार केन्द्रीय सरकार में विहित होने के बजाय तेल और प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग में, सभी संशर्तों से मुक्त रूप में, इस घोषणा के प्रकाशन की इस तारीख को निहित होगा।

अनुसूची

व्ययन सं० सानन्द 38 से सानन्द 18 तक पाइप लाइन बिछाने के लिये

| राज्य : गुजरात | जिला : मेहसाना | तालुका : कामोल | | |
|----------------|----------------|--------------------------|----|----|
| गांव | सर्वेक्षण नं० | हेक्टेयर एं आर ई सेंटिडर | | |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | |
| खाटराज | 343 | 0 | 24 | 61 |
| | 344 | 0 | 05 | 53 |
| | 341 | 0 | 06 | 60 |

47 GI/76-4

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | |
|-------|-------------|---|----|----|
| सनावद | 25 | 0 | 10 | 88 |
| | कार्ट ट्रैक | 0 | 03 | 15 |
| | 26 | 0 | 07 | 76 |
| | 27 | 0 | 11 | 18 |
| | 28 | 0 | 04 | 50 |
| | 37 | 0 | 30 | 36 |
| | 36 | 0 | 18 | 15 |
| | 35/8 | 0 | 10 | 13 |
| | 35/6 | 0 | 05 | 85 |

[सं० 12016/16/75-एल एंड एल]

S.O. No. 2612.—Whereas by a notification of the Govt. of India in the Ministry of Petroleum & Chemicals (Department of Petroleum) S.O. No. 5079 dated 13-11-75 under sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government declared its intention to acquire the Right of User in the lands specified in the Schedule appended to that notification for the purpose of laying pipelines;

And whereas the Competent Authority has under sub-section (1) of section 6 of the said Act, submitted report to the Government;

And further, whereas the Central Government has after considering the said report, decided to acquire the right of user in the lands specified in the Schedule appended to this notification;

Now, therefore in exercise of the power conferred by sub-section (1) of the section 6 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby declares that the right of user in the said lands specified in the schedule appended to this notification hereby acquired for laying the pipelines;

And further in exercise of the power conferred by sub-section (4) of that Section, the Central Government directs that the right of user in the said lands shall instead of vesting in the Central Government vest on this date of the publication of this declaration in the Oil & Natural Gas Commission free from all encumbrances.

SCHEDULE

For laying pipeline from drill site No. Sanand 38 to Sanand 18

| State : Gujarat | District : Mehsana | Taluka : Kalol | | |
|-----------------|--------------------|----------------|-----|----------|
| Villages | Block | Hectare | Are | Centiare |
| Khatraj | No. | | | |
| | 343 | 0 | 24 | 61 |
| | 344 | 0 | 05 | 53 |
| | 341 | 0 | 06 | 60 |
| Sanawad | 25 | 0 | 10 | 88 |
| | Cart-track | 0 | 03 | 15 |
| | 26 | 0 | 07 | 76 |
| | 27 | 0 | 11 | 18 |
| | 28 | 0 | 04 | 50 |
| | 37 | 0 | 30 | 36 |
| | 36 | 0 | 18 | 15 |
| | 35/8 | 0 | 10 | 13 |
| | 35/6 | 0 | 05 | 85 |

[No. 12016/16/75-L&L]

नई दिल्ली, 30 जून, 1976

का० आ० 2613.—यतः पेट्रोलियम, पाइपलाइन (भूमि के उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन भारत सरकार के पेट्रोलियम और रसायन मंत्रालय (पेट्रोलियम विभाग) की अधिसूचना का० आ० सं० 5077

तारीख 29-11-75 द्वारा केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमियों के उपयोग के अधिकार को पाइपलाइन को बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए अर्जित करने का अपना आशय घोषित कर दिया था।

और यतः सक्षम प्राधिकारी ने उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन सरकार को रिपोर्ट दे दी है।

और आगे, यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उक्त रिपोर्ट पर विचार करने के पश्चात् इस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमियों में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का विनिश्चय किया है।

अब, अतः उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्ति का प्रयोग करते हुये केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा घोषित करती है कि इस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट उक्त भूमियों में उपयोग का अधिकार पाइपलाइन बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिये एतद्वारा अर्जित किया जाता है।

और, आगे उस धारा की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुये केन्द्रीय सरकार निदेश देती है कि उक्त भूमियों में उपयोग का अधिकार केन्द्रीय सरकार में विहित होने के बजाय तेल और प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग में, सभी संघर्षों से मुक्त रूप में, इस घोषणा के प्रकाशन की इस तारीख को निहित होगा।

अनुसूची

सन् 39 से एस० आई० पी० पर जी० जी० एस० तक पाइपलाइन बिछाने के लिये

| राज्य : गुजरात | जिला : मेहसाना | तालुका : कादी | | | |
|----------------|----------------|------------------|----------|----|--|
| गांव | सर्वेक्षण न० | हेक्टेयर एम्वारई | सेण्टियर | | |
| थोल | 1423 | 1 | 12 | 07 | |

[सं० 12016/10/75 एल एण्ड एम्]

New Delhi, the 30th June, 1976

S.O. 2613.—Whereas by a notification of the Govt. of India in the Ministry of Petroleum & Chemicals (Department of Petroleum) S.O. No. 5077 dated 29-11-75 under sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government declared its intention to acquire the Right of User in the Lands specified in the Schedule appended to that notification for the purpose of laying pipelines;

And whereas the Competent Authority has under sub-section (1) of section 6 of the said Act, submitted report to the Government;

And further whereas the Central Government has after considering the said report, decided to acquire the right of user in the lands specified in the Schedule appended to this notification;

Now therefore in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 6 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby declares that the right of user in the said land specified in the Schedule appended to this notification hereby acquired for laying the pipelines;

And further in exercise of the power conferred by sub-section (4) of that Section, the Central Government directs that the right of user in the said lands shall instead of vesting in the Central Government vest on this date of the publication of this declaration in the Oil & Natural Gas Commission free from all encumbrances.

SCHEDULE

Laying pipeline from Sanand-39 to GGS at S.I.P.

State : Gujarat District : Mehsana Taluka : Kadi.

| Village | Survey No. | Hectare | Are | Centiare |
|---------|------------|---------|-----|----------|
| Thol | 1423 | 1 | 12 | 07 |

[No. 12016/10/75-L&L]

का० आ० 2614.—यतः पेट्रोलियम, पाइपलाइन (भूमि के उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन भारत सरकार के पेट्रोलियम और रसायन मंत्रालय (पेट्रोलियम विभाग) की अधिसूचना का० आ० सं० 5076, तारीख 13-11-75 द्वारा केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमियों के उपयोग के अधिकार को पाइपलाइन को बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिये अर्जित करने का अपना आशय घोषित कर दिया था।

और यतः सक्षम प्राधिकारी ने उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन सरकार को रिपोर्ट दे दी है।

और आगे, यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उक्त रिपोर्ट पर विचार करने के पश्चात् इस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमियों में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का विनिश्चय किया है।

अब, अतः उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्ति का प्रयोग करते हुये केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा घोषित करती है कि इस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट उक्त भूमियों में उपयोग का अधिकार पाइपलाइन बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिये एतद्वारा अर्जित किया जाता है।

और, आगे उस धारा की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुये केन्द्रीय सरकार निदेश देती है कि उक्त भूमियों में उपयोग का अधिकार केन्द्रीय सरकार में विहित होने के बजाय तेल और प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग में, सभी संघर्षों से मुक्त रूप में, इस घोषणा के प्रकाशन की इस तारीख को निहित होगा।

अनुसूची

सन् 1 और 33 से जी० जी० एस०—एस० आई० पी० तक पाइपलाइन बिछाने के लिए

| राज्य गुजरात | जिला : मेहसाना | तालुका : कादी | | | |
|--------------|----------------|------------------|----------|----|--|
| गांव | सर्वेक्षण | हेक्टेयर एम्वारई | सेण्टियर | | |
| थोल | 1423 | 0 | 93 | 26 | |

[सं० 12016/10/75-एलएण्डएल-II]

एस० के० ओसा, भवर सचिव

S.O. 2614.—Whereas by a notification of the Govt. of India in the Ministry of Petroleum & Chemicals (Department of Petroleum) S.O. No. 5076 dated 13-11-75, under sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government declared its intention to acquire the Right of User in the Lands specified in the Schedule appended to that notification for the purpose of laying pipelines;

And whereas the Competent Authority has under sub-section (1) of section 6 of the said Act, submitted report to the Government;

And further whereas the Central Government has after considering the said report, decided to acquire the right of user in the lands specified in the Schedule appended to this notification;

Now therefore in exercise of the power conferred by sub-section (1) of the section 6 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby declares that the right of user in the said lands specified in the schedule appended to this notification hereby acquired for laying the pipelines;

And further in exercise of the power conferred by sub-section (4) of that Section, the Central Government directs that the right of user in the said lands shall instead of vesting in the Central Government vest on this date of the publication of this declaration in the Oil & Natural Gas Commission free from all encumbrances.

SCHEDULE

For laying pipeline from Sanand 1 & 33 to GGS -SIP

State : Gujarat District- Mehsana Taluka : Kadi.

| Village | Survey No. | Hectare | Arc | Centiare |
|----------------|------------|---------|-----|----------|
| Thol | 1423 | 0 | 93 | 26 |

[No. 12016/10/75-L&L/II]

S. K. OJHA, Under Secy

स्वास्थ्य और परिवार नियोजन मंत्रालय

(स्वास्थ्य विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 1 जुलाई, 1976

का० प्रा० 2615.—यत् केन्द्रीय सरकार ने भारतीय चिकित्सा परिषद, अधिनियम, 1956 (1956 का 102) की धारा 20 की उपधारा (3) के साथ पठित उपखण्ड (1) के अनुसरण में डा० जे०बी० श्री-बास्त्व, जो सरकारी नौकरी से सेवा निवृत्त हो गए हैं, के स्थान पर डा० पी० पी० गोयल, स्वास्थ्य सेवा महानिदेशक, नई दिल्ली को 22 मार्च, 1976 से स्नातकोत्तर चिकित्सा शिक्षा समिति का सदस्य मनोनीत किया है।

अतः अब उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 20 की उपधारा (3) के साथ पठित उपखण्ड (1) का अनुसरण करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा भारत सरकार के स्वास्थ्य और परिवार नियोजन मंत्रालय की 22 मई, 1976 की अधिसूचना संख्या की० 11019/1/75 एम० पी० टी० में निम्नलिखित संशोधन करती है, अर्थात्:—

उक्त अधिसूचना में “केन्द्रीय सरकार द्वारा मनोनीत” शोध के अन्तर्गत क्रम संख्या 2 और उससे संबंधित वर्तमान प्रविष्टि के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित क्रमसंख्या और प्रविष्टि रख ली जाए, अर्थात्:—

2. “डा० पी० पी० गोयल,
स्वास्थ्य सेवा महानिदेशक,
नई दिल्ली।”

[संख्या की-11019/1/76 एम पी टी]

एस० श्रीनिवासन, उप सचिव

MINISTRY OF HEALTH & FAMILY PLANNING

(Department of Health)

New Delhi, the 1st July, 1976

S.O. 2615.—Whereas the Central Government has, in pursuance of sub-section (1) read with sub-section (3) of section 20 of the Indian Medical Council Act, 1956 (102 of 1956), nominated Dr. P. P. Goel, Director General of Health Services, New Delhi, to be a member of the Post-graduate Medical Education Committee vice Dr. J. B. Srivastava who has since retired from the Government service with effect from the 22nd March, 1976.

Now, therefore, in pursuance of sub-section (1) read with sub-section (3) of section 20 of the said Act, the Central

Government hereby makes the following amendment in the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Health and Family Planning No. V. 11019/1/75-MPT, dated the 22nd May, 1975, namely:—

In the said notification, under the heading “Nominated by the Central Government”, for serial No. 2 and the existing entry relating thereto, the following serial No. and entry shall be substituted, namely:—

2. “Dr. P. P. Goel,
Director General of Health Services,
New Delhi”.

[No. V. 11019/1/76-MPT]

S. SRINIVASAN, Dy. Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 25 जून, 1976

का० प्रा० 2616.—औषधि और प्रसाधन सामग्री अधिनियम, 1940 (1940 का 23) की धारा 20 की उपधारा (2) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार डा० पी० डी० सेठी, ज्येष्ठ वैज्ञानिक अधिकारी, केन्द्रीय भारतीय भेषज कोष प्रयोगशाला, गाजियाबाद को औषधि और प्रसाधन सामग्री नियम, 1945 की अनुसूची ग और ग (i) में विनिर्दिष्ट औषधियों से भिन्न सभी औषधियों की बाबत सम्पूर्ण भारत के लिए सरकारी विश्लेषक नियुक्त करती है।

[सं० बार्ड 11033/1/76-डी०एण्ड एम०एस]

New Delhi, the 25th June, 1976

S.O. 2616.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (2) of section 20 of the Drugs and Cosmetics Act, 1940 (23 of 1940), the Central Government hereby appoints Dr. P. D. Sethi, Senior Scientific Officer, Central Indian Pharmacopoeia Laboratory, Ghaziabad, as Government Analyst, for the whole of India, in respect of all drugs other than the drugs specified in the Schedules C (1) to the Drugs and Cosmetics Rules, 1945.

[No. X. 11033/1/76-D&MS]

नई दिल्ली, 26 जून, 1976

का० प्रा० 2617.—औषधि और प्रसाधन सामग्री अधिनियम, 1940 (1940 का 23) की धारा 21 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार (1) श्री अलपति कृष्णदेव, औषधि निरीक्षक, केन्द्रीय औषधि मानक नियंत्रण संगठन, दक्षिणी जोन, मद्रास, (2) श्री देबाशीष रे, औषधि निरीक्षक केन्द्रीय औषधि मानक नियंत्रण संगठन पूर्वी जोन, कलकत्ता, और (3) श्री कपिल भार्गव औषधि निरीक्षक, केन्द्रीय औषधि मानक नियंत्रण संगठन, पश्चिमी जोन, बम्बई को सम्पूर्ण भारत के लिए उक्त अधिनियम के प्रयोजनार्थ निरीक्षक नियुक्त करती है।

[का० सं० एक्स० 11031/1/76 डी०एण्ड एम०एस]

प्रेमनाथ साधु, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 26th June, 1976

S.O. 2617.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 21 of the Drugs and Cosmetics Act, 1940 (23 of 1940), the Central Government hereby appoints (1) Shri Alapati Krishna Dev, Drugs Inspector, Central Drugs Standard Control Organisation, South Zone, Madras, (2) Shri Debasish Ray, Drugs Inspector, Central Drugs Standard Control Organisation, East Zone, Calcutta, and (3) Shri Kapil Bhargava, Drugs Inspector, Central Drugs Standard Control Organisation, West Zone, Bombay, as Inspectors for the purposes of the said Act for the whole of India.

[No. X. 11031/1/76-D&MS]

P. N. SADHOO, Under Secy.

कृषि और सिंचाई मंत्रालय

(खाद्य विभाग)

प्रादेश

नई दिल्ली, 18 जून, 1976

क्रा० प्रा० 2618.—यत् केन्द्रीय सरकार ने खाद्य विभाग, क्षेत्रीय खाद्य निदेशालयों, उपार्थित निदेशालयों और खाद्य विभाग के वेतन तथा सेवा कार्यालय द्वारा किए जाने वाले खाद्यों के श्रय, भण्डारण, मंचलन, परिवहन, वितरण तथा विक्रय के कृत्या का पालन करना बन्द कर दिया है क्योंकि खाद्य निगम अधिनियम, 1964 (1964 का 37) की धारा 11 के अधीन भारतीय खाद्य निगम के कृत्य हैं।

और यत् खाद्य विभाग, क्षेत्रीय खाद्य निदेशालयों, उपार्थित निदेशालयों और खाद्य विभाग के वेतन तथा सेवा कार्यालयों में कार्य कर रहे हैं और उपरिर्खित कृत्यों के पालन में लगे निम्नलिखित अधिकारियों और कर्मचारियों ने केन्द्रीय सरकार के तारीख 16 अप्रैल, 1971 के परिपत्र के प्रत्युत्तर में उनमें विनिर्दिष्ट तारीख के अन्दर भारतीय खाद्य निगम के कर्मचारी बनने अपने अपने प्रमाणों के अधिनियम की धारा 12 ए की उपधारा (1) के परन्तुक द्वारा यथा अपेक्षित सूचना नहीं दी है।

अतः अब खाद्य निगम के अधिनियम, 1964 (1964 का 37) यथा अद्यतन संशोधित की धारा 12 ए द्वारा प्रवृत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्द्वारा निम्नलिखित अधिकारियों और कर्मचारियों को प्रत्येक के सामने दी गई तारीख में भारतीय खाद्य निगम में स्थानान्तरित करती है—

| क्रम सं० | अधिकारी/कर्मचारी का नाम | केन्द्रीय सरकार के अधीन जिन पद पर स्थायी है | स्वान्तरण के समय के अधीन जिस पद पर थे | भारतीय खाद्य निगम की स्थापना के तारीख |
|----------|-------------------------|---|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1. | श्री एस० गी० भट्टाचार्य | सहायक निदेशक | उप-निदेशक | 1-3-69 |
| 2. | श्री यू० सी० बरनवाल | गोदाम अधीक्षक | गोदाम अधीक्षक | -वही- |
| 3. | श्री के० रामू | — | तकनीकी सहायक | -वही- |
| 4. | श्री के० गोशावाकुण्ठन | कनिष्ठ गोदाम रक्षक | वरिष्ठ गोदाम रक्षक | -वही- |
| 5. | श्री बी० एस० जगन्नाथ | — | गण निरीक्षक | -वही- |
| 6. | श्री प्रोम प्रकाश | डाक्टर्मैन ग्रेड-3 | डाक्टर्मैन ग्रेड-3 | 5-7-69 |
| 7. | श्री बी० देवदास | प्रभुमन गण-सहायक | तकनीकी सहायक ग्रेड-1 | 1-3-69 |
| 8. | श्रीमती अलामेनु | कनिष्ठ मक्के | वरिष्ठ क्लर्क | -वही- |
| 9. | श्री हनुमान सिंह | चपरासी | चपरासी | -वही- |
| 10. | श्री के० सुन्दरायाम् | चौकीदार | चौकीदार | -वही- |
| 11. | श्री के० सोन्दराजन | चौकीदार | चौकीदार | -वही- |

[म० 52/8/13-म० पी० iii (खण्ड-6)]

डी० कृष्णामूर्ति, उपा सचिव

MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE & IRRIGATION

(Department of Food)

ORDER

New Delhi, the 18th June, 1976.

S.O.2618.—Whereas the Central Government has ceased to perform the the functions of purchase, storage, movement, transport, distribution and sale of foodgrains done by the Department of Food, the Regional Directors of Food, the Procurement Directorates and the Pay and Accounts Offices of the Department of Food which under section 13 of the Food Corporations Act, 1964 (37 of 1964) are the functions of the Food Corporation of India;

And whereas the following officers and employees serving in the Department of Food, the Regional Directorates of Food, the Procurement Directorates and the Pay & Accounts Offices of the Department of Food and engaged in the performance of the functions mentioned above have not, in response to the circular of the Central Government dated the 16th April, 1971, intimated, within the date specified therein, their intention of not becoming employees of the Food Corporation of India as required by the proviso to sub-section (1) of section 12-A of the said Act;

Now therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 12-A of the Food Corporations Act, 1964 (37 of 1964), as amended upto date, the Central Government hereby transfers the following officers and employees to the Food Corporation of India with effect from the date mentioned against each of them:

| Sl. No. | Name of the Officer/employee. | Permanent Post held under the Central Govt. | Post held under the Central Govt. at the time of transfer | Date of transfer to the Food Corporation of India. |
|---------|-------------------------------|---|---|--|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1. | Shri S. C. Bhatta-charjee | Assistant Director | Deputy Director | 1-3-69 |
| 2. | Shri U.C. Varan-dani | Godown Supt. | Godown Supdt. | -do- |
| 3. | Shri K. Samu | .. | Technical Asstt. | -do- |
| 4. | Shri K. Gopala-krishnan | Junior Godown Keeper. | Senior Godown Keeper | -do- |
| 5. | Shri B. S. Jaga-nnath | .. | Quality Inspector | -do- |
| 6. | Shri Om Prakash | Draftsman Gr. III | Draftsman Gr. III | 5-7-69 |
| 7. | Shri B. Devadass | Fumigation Asstt. | Technical Asstt. Gr. I | 1-3-69 |
| 8. | Shri Alamelu | Junior Clerk | Senior Clerk. | -do- |
| 9. | Shri Hanuman Singh. | Peon | Peon | -do- |
| 10. | Shri K. Subbarayalu | Watchman | Watchman | -do- |
| 11. | Shri K. Soundara-rajana. | Watchman | Watchman | -do- |

[No.52/73-FC-III(Vol. VI)]

D. KRISHNAMURTHI, Dy. Secy.

उर्जा मंत्रालय

(कोयला विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 28 जून, 1976

का० प्रा० 2619.—कोयला वाले क्षेत्र (अर्जन और विकास) अधिनियम, 1957 (1957 का 20) की धारा 4 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन भारत सरकार के उर्जा मंत्रालय (कोयला विभाग) की अधिसूचना सं० का० प्रा० 533, तारीख 7 जनवरी, 1976 द्वारा, केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उस अधिसूचना से उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में खनिजिष्ठ परिक्षेत्र में 69.90 एकड़ (लगभग) या 28.28 हेक्टेयर (लगभग) भूमियों में कोयले के लिए पूर्वेक्षण करने के अपने आणय की सूचना दी थी ;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार का समाधान हो गया है कि उक्त भूमियों में कोयला अभिप्राप्य है ,

अतः, अथ, केन्द्रीय सरकार, कोयला वाले क्षेत्र (अर्जन और विकास) अधिनियम, 1957 (1957 का 20) की धारा 7 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, इससे उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में वर्णित 69.90 एकड़ (लगभग) या 28.28 हेक्टेयर (लगभग) वाली भूमियों को अर्जित करने के अपने आणय की सूचना देती है।

2. इस अधिसूचना के अन्तर्गत आने वाले क्षेत्र के रेखाओं का निरीक्षण उपायुक्त के कार्यालय, गिरिडीह (बिहार) में या कोयला नियंत्रक के कार्यालय 1-काउन्सिल हाउस स्ट्रीट, कलकत्ता में या सेन्ट्रल कोलफील्ड्स लिमिटेड (राजस्व अनुभाग) के कार्यालय बरभंगा हाउस, राप्ती (बिहार) में किया जा सकेगा।

3. कोयला नियंत्रक, 1-काउन्सिल हाउस स्ट्रीट, कलकत्ता को केन्द्रीय सरकार द्वारा अधिनियम के अधीन मुख्य अधिकारी के रूप में नियुक्त किया गया है।

अनुसूची

घोबीडीह जल्कती ब्लाक गिरिडीह कोयला वाले क्षेत्र
रेखाचित्र सं० राजस्व/20/76
तारीख 9-3-76 (जिसमें अर्जित की जाने वाली भूमियां दर्शित की गई हैं)

उपबलाक—I

सभी अधिकारी

| क्रम सं०. | ग्राम | थाना | थाना सं० | जिला | क्षेत्र | टिप्पणी |
|-----------|--------------------|---------|----------|---------|---------|---------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 1. | मुखपिटोमई पिपरातौर | गिरिडीह | 192 | गिरिडीह | | आंशिक |
| 2. | घोबीडीह | " | 193 | " | " | " |

कुल क्षेत्र

2.65 एकड़ (लगभग)
या 1.07 हेक्टेयर (लगभग)

मुखपिटोमई पिपरातौर ग्राम में अर्जित किए जाने वाले प्लॉट सं०—
311 (भाग), 312 (भाग), 322 (भाग), 454 (पौ), 471-474 (भाग), 475 (भाग), 477 (भाग), 478 (भाग), 479 (भाग), 184 (भाग), 185 (भाग), 486, 487, 489 (भाग), 490 (भाग), और 492 (भाग)।

घोबीडीह ग्राम में अर्जित किए जाने वाले प्लॉट सं०—
223 (भाग) और 225 (भाग)

सीमा वर्णन :—

क-ख:—लाइन मुखपिटोमई पिपरातौर ग्राम के प्लॉट संख्या 312 से होते हुए और प्लॉट सं० 311 की आंशिक पश्चिमी सीमा के साथ साथ जाती है।

ख-ग:—लाइन मुखपिटोमई पिपरातौर ग्राम के प्लॉट सं० 311, 492, 490, 489, 478, 475, 474 और 454 तथा घोबीडीह ग्राम के प्लॉट सं० 225 और 223 से होकर (जो का० प्रा० सं० 2394, तारीख 17-8-65 के अनुसार कोयला वाले क्षेत्र (अर्जन और विकास) अधिनियम, 1957 की धारा 9(i) के अधीन अर्जित क्षेत्रों की सम्मिलित सीमा का भाग है) जाती है।

ग-घ:—लाइन घोबीडीह ग्राम के प्लॉट सं० 223 और 225 तथा मुखपिटोमई पिपरातौर ग्राम के प्लॉट सं० 454 और 474 से होकर जाती है।

घ-क:—लाइन मुखपिटोमई पिपरातौर ग्राम के प्लॉट सं० 174, 471, 477, 478, 479, 485, 884, 322 और 312 से होकर जाती है तथा आरम्भिक बिन्दु 'क' पर मिलती है।

उपबलाक - II

सभी अधिकारी:—

| क्रम संख्या | ग्राम | थाना | थाना सं० | जिला | क्षेत्र | टिप्पणी |
|-------------|------------|---------|----------|---------|---|---------|
| 1. | घोबी डीह | गिरिडीह | 193 | गिरिडीह | | आंशिक |
| 2. | कुरुदुबारी | " | 194 | " | " | " |
| कुल क्षेत्र | | | | | 67.25 एकड़ (लगभग) या 27.21 हेक्टेयर (लगभग) | |

घोबीडीह ग्राम में अर्जित किए जाने वाले प्लॉट सं० :—

114 (भाग), 115 (भाग), 116 (भाग), 117 (भाग), 118 (भाग), 120, 121 (भाग), 122 (भाग), 124 (भाग), 125 (भाग), 126 (भाग), 155 (भाग), 156 (भाग), 157 (भाग), 158 (भाग), 159 (भाग), 160 (भाग), 164 (भाग), 165 (भाग), (भाग), 172 (भाग), 173 (भाग), 174, 175, 176 (भाग), 177 166 (भाग), 200 (भाग), 201 (भाग), 214 (भाग), 215, 216 (भाग), 217 (भाग), 222 (भाग), 223 (भाग), 246 (भाग), 248 (भाग), 249 (भाग), 250 (भाग), 252, 253 (भाग), 254 (भाग), 255 (भाग), 256 से 315, 316 (भाग), 317, 318, 319, 320, 321 (भाग), 322 (भाग), 323, 324 (भाग), 325 (भाग) और 326 से 350

कुरुदुबारी ग्राम में अर्जित किए जाने वाले प्लॉट सं० :—

2030 (भाग), रेल 2119 (भाग), 2120 (भाग), 2121 (भाग), 2122, 2123, 2124, 2125, 2126, 2127 (भाग), 2128 (भाग), 2129 (भाग), 2130, 2131, 3133 (भाग) और 3009 (भाग),

ग-ड:—लाइन उपबलाक 1 के सामान्य बिन्दु से आरम्भ होती है और घोबीडीह ग्राम के प्लॉट सं० 223, 246, 250, 253, 254, 255, 249, 248, 249, 316, 321, 322, 324, 325, 248 से होकर (जो घोबीडीह और कुरुदुबारी ग्राम की सामान्य सीमा तथा का० प्रा० सं० 2394, तारीख 1-8-63 के अनुसार, कोयला वाले क्षेत्र (अर्जन और विकास) अधिनियम, 1957 की धारा 9(1) के अधीन अर्जित क्षेत्र की सामान्य सीमा का भाग जाती है।

ड-व-—लाइन बिन्दु 'ड' से आरम्भ होती है और कुरहुरबारी ग्राम के प्लॉट सं० 3009, 2129, 2128, 2127 से होकर (जो का० आ० सं० 3045, तारीख 15-10-63 के अनुसार कोयला वाले क्षेत्र (अर्जन और विकास) अधिनियम, 1957 की धारा 9(i) के के अधीन अर्जित क्षेत्र की सामान्य सीमा का भाग है) जाती है और एन० सी० डी० सी० की कुरहुरबारी कोलियारी की सीमा पर मिलती है।

व-छ-—लाइन कुरहुरबारी ग्राम से होकर (जो एन० सी० डी० सी० की कुरहुरबारी कोलियारी की सम्मिलित सीमा का भाग है) जाती है।

छ-ज-ग-—लाइन कुरहुरबारी ग्राम के प्लॉट सं० 2133 से फिर कुरहुरी बारी ग्राम के प्लॉट सं० 116, 117, 115, 114, 122, 121, 124, 125, 126, 155, 158, 159, 160, 164, 165, 166, 172, 173, 177, 176, 200, 201, 202, 214, 217, 222 और 223 से होकर जाती है तथा बिन्दु 'ग' पर मिलती है।

[सं० 19 (41)/75-सी० ई० एल०]

एम० आर० ए० रिज्वी, उय सचिव

MINISTRY OF ENERGY

(Department of Coal)

New Delhi, the 28th June, 1976

S. O. 2619.—Whereas by the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Energy (Department of Coal) No. S.O. 533 dated the 7th January, 1976, under sub-section (1) of Section 4 of the Coal Bearing Areas (Acquisition and Development) Act, 1957 (20 of 1957), the Central Government gave notice of its intention to prospect for coal in 69.90 acres (approximately) or 28.28 hectares (approximately) of the lands in the locality specified in the Schedule appended to that notification.

And whereas the Central Government is satisfied that coal is obtainable in the said lands;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 7 of the Coal Bearing Areas (Acquisition and Development) Act, 1957 (20 of 1957), the Central Government hereby gives notice of its intention to acquire the lands measuring 69.90 acres (approximately) or 28.28 hectares (approximately) described in the Schedule appended hereto.

2. The plan of the area covered by this notification may be inspected in the office of the Deputy Commissioner Giridih (Bihar) or in the office of the Coal Controller, 1 Council House Street Calcutta or in the Office of the Central Coal fields limited, (Revenue Section) Darbhanga House, Ranchi (Bihar).

3. The Coal Controller, 1-Council House Street, Calcutta has been appointed by the Central Government as the competent authority under the Act.

SCHEDULE

Dhobidih-Jatkuil Block

Giridih Coalfield

DRG. No. Rev/20/76

Dated 9-3-76

(Showing lands to be acquired).

Sub-Block—I

| All Rights | | | | | |
|--|---------|-----------|----------|------|---------|
| Serial Village No. | Thana | Thana No. | District | Area | Remarks |
| 1. Mukhptemai Pipratnir | Giridih | 192 | Giridih | | Part |
| 2. Dhobidih | ,, | 193 | ,, | | ,, |
| Total Area : 2.65 acres (approximately) or 1.07 hectares (approximately) | | | | | |

Plot numbers to be acquired in village Mukhptemai, mai Pipratnir :—

311 (Part), 312 (Part), 322 (Part), 454(P), 471 (Part) 474 (Part), 475 (Part), 477 (Part), 478 (Part), 479 (Part), 484 (Part), 485 (Part), 486, 487, 488, 489 (Part), 490 (Part), & 492 (Part).

Plot numbers to be acquired in village Dhobidih :—

223 (Part) & 225 (Part).

Boundary Description :—

A-B line passes through plot no. 312 and along the part Western boundary of plot no. 311 of village Mukhptemai Pipratnir.

B-C line passes through plot nos. 311, 492, 490, 489, 478, 475 474 & 454 of village Mukhptemai-Pipratnir and through plot nos. 225 & 223 of village Dhobidih (which forms part common boundary of the areas acquired u/s (9)(1) of C.B.A. (A&D) Act, 1956 vide S.O. No. 2394 dt. 17-8-63.

C-D line passes through plot nos. 223 & 225 of village Dhobidih and plot nos. 454 & 474 of village Mukhptemai-Pipratnir.

D-A line passes through plot nos. 474, 471, 477, 478, 479 485, 484, 322 and 312 of village Mukhptemai-Pipratnir. and meets at starting point 'A'.

Sub-Block-II

All Rights.

| Sl. Village No. | Thana | Thana No. | District | Area | Remarks |
|---|---------|-----------|----------|------|---------|
| 1. Dhobidih | Giridih | 193 | Giridih | | Part |
| 2. Kurhurbaree | ,, | 194 | ,, | | ,, |
| Total area:—67.25 acres (approximately) or 27.21 hectares (approximately) | | | | | |

Plot numbers to be acquired in village Dhobidih :—

114 (Part), 115 (Part), 116 (Part), 117 (Part), 118, 120, 121 (Part), 122 (Part), 124(Part), 125 (Part), 126 (Part), 155 (Part), 156, 157, 158 (Part), 159 (Part), 160 (Part), 164 (Part), 165 (Part), 166 (Part), 172 (Part), 173(Part), 174, 175, 176 (Part), 177 (Part), 200 (Part), 201 (Part), 202 (Part), 214 (Part), 215, 216 (Part), 217 (Part), 222 (Part), 223 (Part), 246 (Part), 248 (Part), 249 (Part), 250 (Part), 252, 253 (Part), 254 (Part), 255 (Part), 256 to 315, 316 (Part), 317, 318, 319, 320, 321 (Part), 322 (Part), 323 (Part) 324 (Part), 325 (Part), & 326 to 350.

Plot numbers to be acquired in village Kurhurbaree :—

2030 (Part), Railway 2119 (Part), 2120 (Part), 2121(Part), 2122 2123, 2124, 2125, 2126, 2127 (Part), 2128 (Part), 2129 (Part) 2130, 2131, 2133 (Part), & 3009 (Part).

Boundary Description :—

C-E line starts from common point of sub-Block-I and passes through plot numbers 223, 246, 250, 253, 254, 255, 249 248, 249, 316, 321, 322, 324, 325, 348 of village Dhobidih (which forms part common boundary of the area acquired u/s 9(1) of the C.B.A. (A&D) Act, 1957, vide S.O. No. 2394 dt. 17-8-63 upto the common boundary village Dhobidih and Kurhurbaree.

E-F line starts from point 'E' and passes through plot number 3009, 2129, 2128, 2127 of village Kurhurbaree (which forms part common boundary of the area acquired u/s 9(1) of C.B.A. (A&D) Act, 1957, vide S.O. No. 3045 dated 15-10-63 and meets at the boundary of NCDC's Kurhurbaree Colliery.

F-G line passes through village Kurhurbaree (which forms part common boundary of NCDC's Kurhurbaree Colliery.

G-H-I-C lines pass through plot number 2133 of village Kurhurbaree then through plot numbers 116, 117, 115, 114, 122, 121, 124, 125, 126, 155, 158, 159, 160, 164, 165, 166, 172, 173, 177, 176, 200, 201, 202, 214, 217, 222 & 223 of village Kurhurbaree and meets at point 'C'.

[No. 19 (41)/75-CEL]

S. R. A. RIZVI, Dy. Secy.

नौवाहन और परिवहन मंत्रालय

(परिवहन पक्ष)

नई दिल्ली, 28 जून, 1976

का० आ० 2620.—विशाखापत्तनम अरजिस्ट्रीकृत (नियोजन का विनियमन) स्कीम, 1968 में और संशोधन करने के लिये स्कीम का एक प्रारूप, डाक कर्मकार (नियोजन का विनियमन) अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 9) की धारा 4 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा यथा अपेक्षित भारत सरकार के नौवहन और परिवहन मंत्रालय (परिवहन पक्ष) की अधिसूचना संख्या 789 तारीख 4 जनवरी, 1976 के अधीन भारत के राजपत्र, भाग 2, खंड 3, उपखंड (2) तारीख 21 फरवरी, 1976 में पृष्ठ 1035 पर प्रकाशित किया गया था, जिसमें उक्त अधिसूचना के राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख से दो मास की अवधि की समाप्ति तक उन सभी व्यक्तियों से आक्षेप और सुझाव मांगे गये थे, जिनके उससे प्रभावित होने की संभावना थी।

और उक्त राजपत्र 8 मार्च, 1976 को जनता को उपलब्ध करा दिया गया था, और केन्द्रीय सरकार को उक्त प्रारूप की बाबत जनता से कोई आक्षेप और सुझाव प्राप्त हुये नहीं हैं,

अतः, अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 4 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुये, विशाखापत्तनम अरजिस्ट्रीकृत डाक कर्मकार (नियोजन का विनियमन) स्कीम, 1968 में और संशोधन करने के लिये निम्नलिखित स्कीम बनाती है, अर्थात्:—

1. संक्षिप्त नाम और प्रारम्भ:—(1) इस स्कीम का संक्षिप्त नाम विशाखापत्तनम अरजिस्ट्रीकृत डाक कर्मकार (नियोजन का विनियमन) द्वितीय संशोधन स्कीम 1976 है।

(2) यह राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख को प्रवृत्त होगी।

2. विशाखापत्तनम अरजिस्ट्रीकृत डाक कर्मकार (नियोजन का विनियमन), स्कीम, 1968 के खंड 21 में, “नियुक्त चिकित्सक अधिकारी, शब्दों के स्थान पर “स्थापित चिकित्सा बोर्ड” शब्द रखे जायेंगे।

[सं एल० डी० के० 7/7/75-II]

MINISTRY OF SHIPPING & TRANSPORT

(Transport Wing)

New Delhi, the 28th June, 1976

S.O. 2620.—Whereas certain draft scheme further to amend the Visakhapatnam Unregistered (Regulation of Employment) Scheme, 1968 was published as required by sub-section (1) of section 4 of the Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Act, 1948 (9 of 1948) at pages 1035 of the Gazette of India, Part II, section 3, sub-section (ii), dated the 21st February, 1976 under the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Shipping and Transport (Transport Wing) No. S.O. 789 dated the 4th January, 1976 inviting objections and suggestions from all persons likely to be affected thereby, till the expiry of a period of two months from the date of publication of the said notification in the Official Gazette;

And whereas the said Gazette was made available to the public on the 8th March, 1976,

And whereas no objections and suggestions have been received from the public on the said draft by the Central Government;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 4 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby makes the following scheme to amend the Visakhapatnam Unregistered Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Scheme, 1968 namely:—

1. Short title and commencement.—(1) This Scheme may be called the Visakhapatnam Unregistered Dock Workers

(Regulation of Employment) Second Amendment, Scheme, 1976.

(2) It shall come into force on the date of its publication in the Official Gazette.

2. In clause 21 of the Visakhapatnam Unregistered Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Scheme, 1968, for the words “Medical Officer appointed”, the words “Medical Board set up” shall be substituted.

[No. LDK/7/7/75-II]

का० आ० 2621.—काण्डला अरजिस्ट्रीकृत डाक कर्मकार (नियोजन का विनियमन) स्कीम, 1968 में और संशोधन करने के लिये स्कीम का एक प्रारूप, डाक कर्मकार (नियोजन का विनियमन) अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 9) की धारा 4 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा यथा अपेक्षित भारत सरकार के नौवहन और परिवहन मंत्रालय (परिवहन पक्ष) की अधिसूचना संख्या 788 तारीख 4 जनवरी, 1976 के अधीन भारत के राजपत्र, भाग 2, खंड 3, उपखंड (2) तारीख 21 फरवरी, 1976 में पृष्ठ 1035 पर प्रकाशित किया गया था, जिसमें उक्त अधिसूचना के राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख से दो मास की अवधि की समाप्ति तक उन सभी व्यक्तियों से आक्षेप और सुझाव मांगे गये थे, जिनके उससे प्रभावित होने की संभावना थी।

और उक्त राजपत्र 8 मार्च, 1976 को जनता को उपलब्ध करा दिया गया था,

और केन्द्रीय सरकार को उक्त प्रारूप की बाबत जनता से कोई आक्षेप और सुझाव प्राप्त नहीं हुये हैं,

अतः, अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 4 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुये, काण्डला अरजिस्ट्रीकृत डाक कर्मकार (नियोजन का विनियमन) स्कीम, 1968 में और संशोधन करने के लिये निम्नलिखित स्कीम बनाती है, अर्थात्:—

1. संक्षिप्त नाम और प्रारम्भ:—(1) इस स्कीम का संक्षिप्त नाम काण्डला अरजिस्ट्रीकृत डाक कर्मकार (नियोजन का विनियमन) संशोधन स्कीम, 1976 है।

(2) यह राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख को प्रवृत्त होगी।

2. काण्डला अरजिस्ट्रीकृत डाक कर्मकार (नियोजन का विनियमन) स्कीम, 1968 के खंड 14 के उपखंड (2) में “नाम निर्देशित चिकित्सा अधिकारी” के स्थान पर “स्थापित चिकित्सा बोर्ड” शब्द रखे जायेंगे।

[सं एल० डी० के० 7/7/75-I]

बी० एस० रत्नम्, अवर सचिव

S.O. 2621.—Whereas certain draft scheme further to amend the Kandla Unregistered Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Scheme, 1968 was published as required by sub-section (1) of section 4 of the Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Act, 1948 (9 of 1948) at page 1035 of the Gazette of India, Part II, Section 3, sub-section (ii) dated the 21st February, 1976 under the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Shipping and Transport (Transport Wing) No. S. O. 788 dated the 4th January, 1976 inviting objections and suggestions from all persons likely to be affected thereby, till the expiry of a period of two months from the date of publication of the said notification in the Official Gazette;

And whereas the said Gazette was made available to the public on the 8th March, 1976;

And whereas no objections and suggestions have been received from the public on the said draft by the Central Government;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 4 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby makes the following scheme to amend

the Kandla Unregistered Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Scheme, 1968, namely :—

1. (1) This scheme may be called the Kandla Unregistered Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Amendment, Scheme, 1976.

(2) It shall come into force on the date of its publication in the Official Gazette.

2. In sub-clause (2) of clause 14 of the Kandla Unregistered Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Scheme, 1968, for the words "Medical Officer nominated" the words "Medical Board set up" shall be substituted.

[No. LDK 7/7/75-I]

B. S. RATNAM, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 1 जुलाई, 1976

(व्यापार पोत)

क्र० आ० 2622.—व्यापार पोत अधिनियम, 1958 (1958 का 44) को धारा 283 के खंड (क) के उपबन्धों के अनुसरण में तथा भारत सरकार, नौवहन और पत्तवहन मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना सं० सा० आ० 368 दिनांक 19 जनवरी, 1973 के अतिरिक्त में, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा घोषणा करती है कि निम्नलिखित सारणी के स्तम्भ (1) में विनिर्दिष्ट देशों ने, प्रत्येक देश के सामने उक्त सारणी के स्तम्भ (2) में तदनुसंगी प्रविष्टि में निर्दिष्ट तारीखों से अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय भार रेखा संगमन, 1966 को स्वीकार कर लिया है या जैसी भी स्थिति हो, मान लिया है।

सारणी

उस देश का नाम जिन्होंने अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय भार रेखा संगमन, 1966 को स्वीकार कर लिया है या मान लिया है।

| 1 | 2 |
|--|------------------|
| 1. पनामा | 13 मई, 1966 |
| 2. सोवियत समाजवादी गणतन्त्र संघ | 4 जुलाई, 1966 |
| 3. टुनीशिया | 23 अगस्त, 1966 |
| 4. टिनिडाड तथा टोबैगो | 24 अगस्त, 1966 |
| 5. संघ राज्य अमरीका | 17 नवम्बर, 1966 |
| 6. फॉस | 30 नवम्बर, 1966 |
| 7. दक्षिण अफ्रीका | 14 दिसम्बर, 1966 |
| 8. मबगसकर | 16 जनवरी, 1967 |
| 9. पेरू | 18 जनवरी, 1967 |
| 10. सोमालिया | 30 मार्च, 1967] |
| 11. लिबेरिया | 8 मई, 1967 |
| 12. डेनमार्क | 28 जून, 1967 |
| 13. इजराइल | 5 जुलाई, 1967 |
| 14. यू० के० | 16 जुलाई, 1967 |
| 15. नीदरलैंड सुरीनाम तथा भीयरलैंड एण्टीलेस | 21 जुलाई, 1967 |
| 16. स्वीडन | 28 जुलाई, 1967 |
| 17. मौरीटानिया | 4 दिसम्बर, 1967 |
| 18. मोरोक्को | 19 जनवरी, 1968 |
| 19. मालदीव | 29 जनवरी, 1968 |
| 20. नार्वे | 19 मार्च, 1968 |
| 21. इटली | 19 अप्रैल, 1968 |
| 22. भारत | 19 अप्रैल, 1968 |
| 23. स्विटजरलैंड | 23 अप्रैल, 1968 |
| 24. जापान | 15 मई, 1968 |
| 25. फिनलैंड | 15 मई, 1968 |
| 26. जैरे | 20 मई, 1968 |

| 1 | 2 |
|-----------------------------|------------------|
| 27. ग्रीस | 12 जून, 1968 |
| 28. दक्षिणी विषतनाम गणराज्य | 14 जून, 1968 |
| 29. स्पेन | 1 जुलाई, 1968 |
| 30. आस्ट्रेलिया | 29 जुलाई, 1968 |
| 31. तुर्की | 5 अगस्त, 1968 |
| 32. आयरलैंड | 28 अगस्त, 1968 |
| 33. कुवैत | 28 अगस्त, 1968 |
| 34. पाना | 25 सितम्बर, 1968 |
| 35. युगोस्लाविया | 25 अक्टूबर, 1968 |
| 36. नाइजीरिया | 14 नवम्बर, 1968 |
| 37. पाकिस्तान | 5 दिसम्बर, 1968 |
| 38. मिश्र | 6 दिसम्बर, 1968 |
| 39. बलगारिया | 30 दिसम्बर, 1968 |
| 40. बेल्जियम | 22 जनवरी, 1969 |
| 41. म्यूबा | 6 फरवरी, 1969 |
| 42. किलोपाइम्स | 4 मार्च, 1969 |
| 43. संघ राज्य जर्मनी | 9 अप्रैल, 1969 |
| 44. साइप्रस | 5 मई, 1969 |
| 45. जनवादी यमन | 20 मई, 1969 |
| 46. पोलैंड | 28 मई, 1969 |
| 47. चेकोस्लोवाकिया | 16 जून, 1969 |
| 48. बोर्निया गणराज्य | 10 जुलाई, 1969 |
| 49. ब्राजील | 12 सितम्बर, 1969 |
| 50. पुर्तगाल | 22 दिसम्बर, 1969 |
| 51. बर्नाडा | 14 जनवरी, 1970 |
| 52. न्यूजीलैंड | 5 फरवरी, 1970 |
| 53. मोनेको | 25 मार्च, 1970 |
| 54. मैक्सिको | 25 मार्च, 1970 |
| 55. आइसलैंड | 24 जून, 1970 |
| 56. नेब्रामा | 7 जुलाई, 1970 |
| 57. जाम्बिया | 2 सितम्बर, 1970 |
| 58. मनेशिया | 12 जनवरी, 1971 |
| 59. अर्जेंटीना | 3 जून, 1971 |
| 60. रोमनिया | 3 जून, 1971 |
| 61. आइबरी कोस्ट | 19 जुलाई, 1971 |
| 62. सिंगापोर | 21 सितम्बर, 1971 |
| 63. आस्ट्रिया | 4 अगस्त, 1972 |
| 64. फिजी | 29 नवम्बर, 1972 |
| 65. डोमिनिकन रिपब्लिक | 28 जून, 1973 |
| 66. हंगरी | 25 सितम्बर, 1973 |
| 67. चीन | 5 अक्टूबर, 1973 |
| 68. ईरान | 5 अक्टूबर, 1973 |
| 69. श्रीलंका | 10 मई, 1974 |
| 70. लिबियन अरब रिपब्लिक | 12 अगस्त, 1974 |
| 71. माल्टा | 11 सितम्बर, 1974 |
| 72. वेन्जुएला | 15 अक्टूबर, 1974 |
| 73. सिरियन अरब रिपब्लिक | 6 फरवरी, 1975 |
| 74. चिली | 10 मार्च, 1975 |
| 75. जर्मन जनवादी गणराज्य | 15 मई, 1975 |
| 76. अमन | 20 अगस्त, 1975 |
| 77. सऊदी अरब | 5 सितम्बर, 1975 |
| 78. केन्या | 12 सितम्बर, 1975 |
| 79. इकोदर | 12 जनवरी, 1976 |

[सं० 11 एम० टी० ओ (11)/76-एम० ए०]

वीरान चम्प अहीर, अधर सचिव

New Delhi, the 1st July, 1976.

(Merchant Shipping)

S.O. 2622—In pursuance of the provisions of clause (a) of Section 283 of the Merchant Shipping Act, 1958 (44 of 1958) and in Supersession of the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Shipping and Transport No. S.O. 368, dated the 19th January, 1973, the Central Government hereby declares that the Countries specified in Column (1) of the Table set out below have accepted or, as the case may be acceded to the International Convention on Load Lines, 1966, with effect from the dates indicated against each country in the corresponding entry in Column (2) of the said Table :—

TABLE

| Name of the country which has accepted or acceded to the International Convention on Load Lines, 1966. | Date of acceptance or accession. |
|--|----------------------------------|
| (1) | (2) |
| 1. Panama | 13th May, 1966 |
| 2. Union of Soviet Socialist Republic | 4th July, 1966 |
| 3. Tunisia | 23rd August, 1966 |
| 4. Trinidad and Tobago | 24th August, 1966 |
| 5. United States of America | 17th November, 1966 |
| 6. France | 30th November, 1966 |
| 7. South Africa | 14th December, 1966 |
| 8. Madagascar | 16th January, 1967 |
| 9. Peru | 18th January, 1967 |
| 10. Somalia | 30th March, 1967 |
| 11. Liberia | 8th May, 1967 |
| 12. Denmark | 28th June, 1967 |
| 13. Israel | 5th July, 1967 |
| 14. United Kingdom | 11th July, 1967 |
| 15. Netherlands, Surinam and Netherlands Antills | 21st July, 1967 |
| 16. Sweden | 28th July, 1967 |
| 17. Mauritania | 4th December, 1967 |
| 18. Morocco | 19th January, 1968 |
| 19. Maldives | 29th January, 1968 |
| 20. Norway | 19th March, 1968 |
| 21. Italy | 19th April, 1968 |
| 22. India | 19th April, 1968 |
| 23. Switzerland | 23rd April, 1968 |
| 24. Japan | 15th May, 1968 |
| 25. Finland | 15th May, 1968 |
| 26. Zaïre | 20th May, 1968 |
| 27. Greece | 12th June, 1968 |
| 28. Republic of South Vietnam | 14th June, 1968 |
| 29. Spain | 1st July, 1968 |
| 30. Australia | 29th July, 1968 |
| 31. Turkey | 5th August, 1968 |
| 32. Ireland | 28th August, 1968 |
| 33. Kuwait | 28th August, 1968 |
| 34. Ghana | 25th September, 1968 |
| 35. Yugoslavia | 25th October, 1968 |
| 36. Nigeria | 14th November, 1968 |
| 37. Pakistan | 5th December, 1968 |
| 38. Egypt | 6th December, 1968 |
| 39. Bulgaria | 30th December, 1968 |
| 40. Belgium | 22nd January, 1969 |
| 41. Cuba | 6th February, 1969 |
| 42. Phillipines | 4th March, 1969 |
| 43. Federal Republic of Germany | 9th April, 1969 |
| 44. Cyprus | 5th May, 1969 |
| 45. Demociate Yemen | 20th May, 1969 |
| 46. Poland | 28th Ma , 1969 |
| 47. Czechoslovakia | 16th June, 1969 |
| 48. Korea Republic of | 10th July, 1969 |

(1)

(2)

| | |
|--|----------------------|
| 49. Brazil | 12th September, 1969 |
| 50. Portugal | 22nd December, 1969 |
| 51. Canada | 14th January, 1970 |
| 52. New Zealand | 5th February, 1970 |
| 53. Monaco | 25th March, 1970 |
| 54. Mexico | 25th March, 1970 |
| 55. Iceland | 24th June, 1970 |
| 56. Lebanon | 7th July, 1970 |
| 57. Zambia | 2nd September, 1970 |
| 58. Malaysia | 12th January, 1971 |
| 59. Argentina | 3rd June, 1971 |
| 60. Romania | 3rd June, 1971 |
| 61. Ivory Coast | 19th July, 1971 |
| 62. Singapore | 21st September, 1971 |
| 63. Austria | 4th August, 1972 |
| 64. Fiji | 29th November, 1972 |
| 65. Dominican Republic | 28th June, 1973 |
| 66. Hungary | 25th September, 1973 |
| 67. China | 5th October, 1973 |
| 68. Iran | 5th October, 1973 |
| 69. Sri Lanka | 10th May, 1974 |
| 70. Libyan Arab Republic | 12th August, 1974 |
| 71. Malia | 11th September, 1974 |
| 72. Venezuela | 15th October, 1974 |
| 73. Syria Arab Republic | 6th February, 1975 |
| 74. Chile | 10th March, 1975 |
| 75. German Democratic Republic | 15th May, 1975 |
| 76. Oman | 20th August, 1975 |
| 77. Saudi Arabia | 5th September, 1975 |
| 78. Kenya | 12th September, 1975 |
| 79. Ecuador | 12th January, 1976 |

[No. 11-MTO(11)/76-MA

D. C. AHIR, Under Secy.

निर्माण और आवास मंत्रालय

(निर्माण प्रभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 26 जून, 1976

क्र० आ० 2623.—राजघाट समाधि अधिनियम 1951 (1951 का 43) की धारा 4 की उप-धारा 1 के खड (ख) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुये, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा निर्माण और आवास मंत्रालय के संयुक्त सचिव (वित्त) श्री एन० के० रेवारी को श्री प्रेम नाथ, वित्तीय सलाहकार (निर्माण और आवास) के स्थान पर, राजघाट समाधि कमेटी के सचिव के रूप में नामांकित करती है तथा भारत सरकार के भूतपूर्व निर्माण आवास तथा पूर्ति मंत्रालय के 22 अगस्त, 1962 की अधिसूचना संख्या 19/2/62-डब्ल्यू० में निम्नलिखित आगे और संशोधन करती है, नामतः—

अधिसूचना में मद संख्या 2 की वर्तमान प्रविष्टि के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित प्रविष्टि की जाय—

“श्री एन० के० रेवारी, संयुक्त सचिव (वित्त) निर्माण और आवास मंत्रालय”

[संख्या 25012(3)/72-डब्ल्यू० 3]

आर० एम्० ग्रहलुवालिया, उप सचिव

MINISTRY OF WORKS AND HOUSING

(Works Division)

New Delhi, the 26th June, 1976

S.O. 2623.—In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (b) of sub-section (1) of Section 4 of the Rajghat Samadhi Act, 1951 (41 of 1951), the Central Government hereby

nominates Shri N. K. Rewari, Joint Secretary (Finance), Ministry of Works and Housing, to be a member of the Rajghat Samadhi Committee vice Shri Prem Nath Financial Adviser (Works and Housing) and makes the following further amendment in the notification of the Government of India in the late Ministry of Works, Housing and Supply No. 19/2/62-WI dated the 22nd August, 1962, namely :—

In the said notification, for the existing entry against item 2, the following entry shall be substituted namely :—

“Shri N. K. Rewari, Joint Secretary (Finance), Ministry of Works and Housing.”

[No. 25012(3)/72-W3]

R. L. AHLUWALIA, Dy. Secy.

दिल्ली विकास, प्राधिकरण

सार्वजनिक सूचना

नई दिल्ली, 10 जुलाई, 1976

का० आ० 2624.—केन्द्रीय सरकार दिल्ली मुख्य योजना में निम्नलिखित संशोधन करने का विचार कर रही है। इसे सार्वजनिक सूचना के लिए प्रकाशित किया जा रहा है। इस संशोधन के सम्बन्ध में यदि किसी व्यक्ति को आपत्ति/सुझाव देना हो तो वे अपने आपत्ति/सुझाव इस शायन के 30 दिन के भीतर सचिव, दिल्ली विकास प्राधिकरण, विकास मीनार, इन्द्रप्रस्था इस्टेट नई दिल्ली-1 के पास लिखित रूप में भेज सकते हैं। जो व्यक्ति अपनी आपत्ति/सुझाव दे वे अपना नाम तथा पता भी लिखें।

संशोधन

“बजौरपुर औद्योगिक क्षेत्र में औद्योगिक उपयोग (लघु उद्योग) के लिये निविष्ट क्षेत्र में से 0.52 है० (1.3 एकड़) क्षेत्र के भूमि उपयोग को चमड़े की वस्तुओं के लिए ‘फ्लैट्टेड फैक्ट्रीज’ में परिवर्तित किये जाने का प्रस्ताव है।”

शनिवार को छोड़कर समस्त कार्यशील दिनों में दिल्ली विकास प्राधिकरण के कार्यालय, विकास मीनार, 11वीं मंजिल, मुख्य योजना अनुभाग, इन्द्रप्रस्था इस्टेट, नई दिल्ली-1 में उक्त अवधि में आकर प्रस्तावित संशोधन के मानचित्र का निरीक्षण किया जा सकता है।

[स० एफ० 20(5)/76-एम० पी०]

हृदय नाथ फोतेदार, सचिव

DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

PUBLIC NOTICE

New Delhi, the 10th July, 1976

S.O. 2624.—The following modification which the Central Government proposes to make to the Master Plan for Delhi is hereby published for public information. Any person having any objection or suggestion with respect to the proposed modification may send his objection or suggestion in writing to the Secretary, Delhi Development Authority Vilas Minar, Indraprastha Estate, New Delhi within a period of thirty days from the date of this notice. The person making the objection or suggestion should also give his name and full address.

MODIFICATION

“The land use of an area measuring 0.52 hect. (1.3 acres) out of the land, earmarked for ‘industrial use’ (Light Manufacturing) in Wazirpur Industrial Area, is proposed to be changed to ‘flatted factories’ for leather goods.”

The plan indicating the proposed modification will be available for inspection at the office of the Authority, Vikas Minar, New Delhi on all working days except Saturdays, within the period referred to above.

[No. F. 20(5)/76-M.P.]

H. N. FOTEDAR, Secy.

संचार मंत्रालय

(डाक तार बोर्ड)

नई दिल्ली, 2 जुलाई, 1976

का० आ० 2625.—स्वादेश संख्या 627, दिनांक 8 मार्च, 1960 द्वारा लागू किये गये भारतीय तार नियम, 1951 के नियम 434 के खंड III के पैरा (क) के अनुसार डाक-तार महानिदेशक ने राजपुरा टेलीफोन केन्द्र में दिनांक 1-8-76 के पमाणित दर प्रणाली लागू करने का निश्चय किया है।

[संख्या 5-7/76 पी० एच० बी०]

पी० सी० गुप्ता, सहायक महानिदेशक (पी०एच०बी०)

MINISTRY OF COMMUNICATIONS

(P&T Board)

New Delhi, the 2nd July, 1976

S.O. 2625.—In pursuance of para (a) of Section III of Rule 434 of Indian Telegraph Rules, 1951, as introduced by S. O. 627 dated 8th March, 1960, the Director General, Posts and Telegraphs, hereby specifies the 1-8-1976 as the date on which the Measured Rate System will be introduced in Rajpura Telephone Exchange, N. W. Circle.

[No. 5-7/76-PHB.]

P. C. GUPTA, Assistant Director General (PHB)

पूति और पुनर्वासि मंत्रालय

(पुनर्वासि विभाग)

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 15 मई, 1976

का० आ० 2626.—केन्द्रीय मित्रिल सेवा (वर्गीकरण, नियंत्रण और अपील) नियमावली, 1965 के नियम 9 के उपनियम (2), नियम 12 के उपनियम (2) की धारा (ख) तथा नियम 24 के उपनियम (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुये, राष्ट्रपति भारत सरकार, पूति और पुनर्वासि मंत्रालय (पुनर्वासि विभाग) के आदेश संख्या 1(4)/68-सतर्कता, दिनांक 29 नवम्बर, 1975 में निम्न संशोधन करते हैं, अर्थात्:—
उक्त आदेश की अनुसूची में—

(क) “भाग-II, सामान्य केन्द्रीय सेवा श्रेणी III” के कालम 2 तथा 3 में शब्द “बन्दोबस्त आयुक्त” के स्थान पर शब्द “उप मुख्य बन्दोबस्त आयुक्त” प्रतिस्थापित किये जायेंगे।

(ख) “भाग III, सामान्य केन्द्रीय सेवा श्रेणी IV” के कालम 5 में शब्द “बन्दोबस्त आयुक्त” के स्थान पर शब्द “उप मुख्य बन्दोबस्त आयुक्त” प्रतिस्थापित किये जायेंगे।

[संख्या 1(4)/68-सतर्कता]

जे० चक्रवर्ती, उप सचिव

MINISTRY OF SUPPLY AND REHABILITATION

(Department of Rehabilitation)

ORDER

New Delhi, the 15th May, 1976

S.O. 2626.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-rule (2) of rule 9, clause (b) of sub-rule (2) of rule 12 and sub-rule (1) of rule 24 of the Central Civil Services (Classification, Control and Appeal) Rules, 1963, the President hereby makes the following amendments in the Order of the Government of India in the Ministry of Supply and

Rehabilitation (Department of Rehabilitation) No. 1/4/68-AV dated the 29 November 1975 namely :—

In the Schedule to the said order,—

- (a) in "Part II General Central Service—Class-III", in columns 2 and 3, for the words "Settlement Commissioner", the words "Deputy Chief Settlement Commissioner" shall be substituted;
- (b) in "Part III General Central Services—Class IV" in column 5, for the words "Settlement Commissioner", the words "Deputy Chief Settlement Commissioner" shall be substituted.

[No. 1/4/68-AV]
J. CHAKRABARTY, Dy. Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 24 जून, 1976

का० प्रा० 2627—निष्ठागत हित (पार्श्व) अधिनियम, 1951 (1951 का LXIV) की धारा 13 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुये तथा भारत सरकार के श्रम, रोजगार और पुनर्वासि मंत्रालय, पुनर्वासि विभाग की अधिसूचना संख्या 5(1)/प्रशा०-II-70, दिनांक 5 मई, 1970 का प्रतिक्रमण करते हुये केन्द्रीय सरकार इसके द्वारा विद्यो कर अधिकरण, दिल्ली प्रशासन, दिल्ली के अध्यक्ष श्री रजनी कान्त को, तत्काल प्रभाव से, दिल्ली संघ शामिल क्षेत्र के लिये अपील अधिकारी के रूप में नियुक्त करती है।

[संख्या 1(8)/विशेष सेल/75-एस० एम०-II]

डीना नाथ असीजा, संयुक्त निदेशक

New Delhi, the 24th June, 1976

S.O. 2627.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 13 of the Evacuee Interest (Separation) Act, 1951 (LXIV of 1951), and in supersession of Government of India in the Ministry of Labour, Employment & Rehabilitation, Department of Rehabilitation Notification No. 5(4)/Admn. II/70, dated the 5th May, 1970, the Central Government hereby appoints Shri Rajni Kant, Chairman, Sales Tax Tribunal, Delhi Administration, Delhi as Appellate Officer for the Union Territory of Delhi with immediate effect.

[No. 1(8)/Spl. Cell/75-SS. II]

D. N. ASIJA, Jt. Dir.

श्रम मंत्रालय

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 27 फरवरी, 1976

का० प्रा० 2628.—केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि हमसे उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषयों के बारे में खालसा स्टोन कम्पनी, खान स्वामियों की राजपुरा बलुआ पत्थर खान, छावनी जौराहा, कोटा के प्रबन्धतन्त्र से सम्बन्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है,

और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिये निर्देशित करना वांछनीय समझती है,

अतः, अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 7 क और धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के खड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुये, केन्द्रीय सरकार एक औद्योगिक अधि-करण गठित करती है जिसके पीठासीन अधिकारी श्री यू० एन० माधुर होंगे, जिनका मुख्यालय जयपुर में होगा और उक्त विवाद का उक्त औद्योगिक अधिकरण को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिये निर्देशित करती है।

अनुसूची

क्या मैसर्स खालसा स्टोन कम्पनी की राजपुरा बलुआपत्थर खान छावनी जौराहा, कोटा (राजस्थान) में नियोजित कर्मचारों की 1973-74

के लेखा वर्ष के लिये मजूरियों के 20% की दर से लाभ सहभाजन बोनस के संदाय सम्बन्धी मांग न्यायोचित है? यदि नहीं, तो कर्मकार उक्त लेखा वर्ष के लिये बोनस की किम प्रमाणा के हकदार है?

[सं० एल० 29011/4/76-डी० III(बी०)]

MINISTRY OF LABOUR

ORDER

New Delhi, the 27th February, 1976

S.O. 2628.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of Rajpura Sand Stone Mines of Khalsa Stone Company, Mine Owners, Chhawani Chouraha, Kota and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 7A and clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby constitutes an Industrial Tribunal of which Shri U. N. Mathur shall be the Presiding Officer with headquarters at Jaipur and refers the said dispute for adjudication to the said Industrial Tribunal at Jaipur.

SCHEDULE

Whether the demand of the workmen employed in Rajpura Sand Stone Mine of Messrs Khalsa Stone Company, Chhawani Chouraha, Kota (Rajasthan) for payment of profit sharing Bonus at the rate of 20 per cent of wages for the accounting year 1973-74 is justified? If not, to what quantum of bonus are the workmen entitled for the said accounting year?

[No. L-29011/4/76-D III (B)]

आदेश

का० प्रा० 2629.—केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि हमसे उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषयों के बारे में श्री किशन लाल पुत्र श्री विधी लाल, राजस्थान के जिला बून्दी में खान स्वामी, निवास स्थान और डाकघर लम्बाखो, जिला बून्दी की बरपु बलुआ पत्थर खान के प्रबन्धतन्त्र से सम्बन्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिये निर्देशित करना वांछनीय समझती है,

अतः, अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 7 क और धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के खड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुये, केन्द्रीय सरकार एक औद्योगिक अधि-करण गठित करती है जिसके पीठासीन अधिकारी श्री यू० एन० माधुर होंगे, जिनका मुख्यालय जयपुर में होगा और उक्त विवाद को उक्त औद्योगिक अधिकरण को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिये निर्देशित करती है।

अनुसूची

क्या श्री किशनलाल पुत्र श्री विधीलाल, खान स्वामी, निवास-स्थान तथा डाकघर लम्बाखो, जिला बून्दी की बून्दी जिले (राजस्थान) में स्थित बरपु बलुआ पत्थर खान में नियोजित कर्मकार किन्हीं राष्ट्रीय और त्योहार के दिनों की सवेतन छुट्टियों की मजूरी के हकदार है। यदि हा, तो किन छुट्टियों के लिये और किस वर्ष से?

[संख्या एल०-29011/133/75-डी०-II(बी०)]

ORDER

S.O. 2629.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of Barpu Sand Stone Mine of Shri Kishan Lal, son of Shri Bidhi Lal, Mine Owner in the

District Bundi, Rajasthan, residence and Post Lambhakho District Bundi, and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication,

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by Section 7A and clause (d) of sub-section (i) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby constitutes an Industrial Tribunal of which Shri U. N. Mathur shall be the Presiding Officer, with headquarters at Jaipur and refers the said dispute for adjudication to the said Industrial Tribunal, at Jaipur.

SCHEDULE

Whether the workmen employed in Barpu Sand Stone Mines in the District Bundi (Rajasthan) of Shri Kishan Lal son of Shri Birdhalal, Mine Owner, Residence and post Lambhakho, District Bundhi are entitled for grant of any paid national and festival holidays? If so, on what holidays and from which year?

[No. L-29011/133/75-D III(B)]

आदेश

क्रा० आ० 2230—केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषयों के बारे में ईस्टर्न कोल फील्ड्स लिमिटेड की दालूरबन्द कोलियरी डाकघर पाण्डवेश्वर, जिला वर्देवान के प्रबन्धतन्त्र सम्बन्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिये निर्देशित करना वांछनीय समझती है;

अतः, अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10 की उप-धारा (1) के खंड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुये, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7 क के अधीन गठित केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, कलकत्ता को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिये निर्देशित करती है।

अनुसूची

क्या ईस्टर्न कोल फील्ड्स लिमिटेड की दालूरबन्द कोलियरी, डाकघर पाण्डवेश्वर, जिला वर्देवान के प्रबन्धतन्त्र की श्रीमती कमला कमीन वेगन लोडर को 18-8-75 से कार्यभार की अनुशा न देने की कार्रवाई न्यायोचित है? यदि नहीं, तो यह किस अनुतोष की हकदार है?

[सं० एन०-22012/7/76-डी० III(बी०)]

ORDER

New Delhi, the 17th March, 1976

S.O. 2630.—Whereas the Central Government of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of Dalurband Colliery of Eastern Coal Fields Limited, Post Office Pandaveswar, District Burdwan and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of the section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Calcutta constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

Whether the action of the management of Dalurband Colliery of Eastern Coal Fields Limited, Post Office Pandaveswar, District Burdwan, in refusing to allow Shrimati Kamala Kamin, Wagon Loader, to resume duty with effect from 18-8-75 is justified? If not, to what relief is she entitled?

[No. L-22012/7/76-D III (B)]

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 26 मार्च, 1976

क्रा०आ० 2631.—केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषयों के बारे में ब्रुहर् सब एरिया, बैस्टर्न कोलफील्ड्स लिमिटेड, डाकघर—धानपुरी, जिला शाहडोल के प्रबन्धतन्त्र से सम्बन्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है ;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिये निर्देशित करना वांछनीय समझती है ;

अतः, अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 7 क और धारा 10 की उप-धारा (1) के खंड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुये, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा एक औद्योगिक अधिकरण गठित करती है जिसके पोस्टासीन अधिकारी श्री एन०पी० गंज होंगे, जिनका मुख्यालय इन्दौर में होगा और उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिकरण को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिये निर्देशित करती है ।

अनुसूची

क्या बैस्टर्न कोलफील्ड्स लि० की अमलाई कोलियरी, डाकघर—धानपुरी जिला शाहडोल के प्रबन्धतन्त्र की श्री स्वारथ सुपुत्र जतन, स्थाई टब-लोडर, अमलाई कोलियरी को पत्र संख्या सी-एम० ए०/ए० ए० एम/एम०जी०आर०/1-2, तारीख 8-7-75 द्वारा पदभूत करने की कार्यवाही वैध और न्यायोचित है ? यदि नहीं, तो उक्त कर्मकार किस अनुतोष का हकदार है ?

[संख्या एन०-22012/6/76-डी०-3 बी०]

ORDER

New Delhi, the 26th March, 1976

S.O. 2631.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of Burhar Sub Area of Western Coalfields Limited, Post Office Dhanpuri, District Shahdol and their workmen in respect of the matter specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication.

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 7A, and clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10, of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby constitutes an Industrial Tribunal of which Shri S. P. Bhargava shall be the Presiding Officer with headquarters at Indore and refers the said dispute for adjudication to the said Tribunal.

SCHEDULE

Whether the action of the management of Amlai Colliery of Western Coalfields Limited, Post Office Dhanpuri, District Shahdol in terminating the services of Sri Swarath son of Jatan, permanent Tub-Loader of Amlai Colliery vide letter No. CMA/AAL/MGR/4-II dated 8-7-75 is legal and justified? If not, to what relief is the said workman entitled?

[No. L-22012/6/76-D-III(B)]

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 2 अप्रैल, 1976

क्रा०आ० 2632.—केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषयों के बारे में सुर्चा कोलियरी, डाकघर सुर्चा कोलियरी, जिला सरगुजा (मध्य प्रदेश) के प्रबन्धतन्त्र से सम्बन्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है ;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिये निर्देशित करना वांछनीय समझती है ।

अतः, अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 7क और धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (घ) द्वारा प्रवृत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एक औद्योगिक अधि-करण गठित करती है जिसके पीठासीन अधिकारी श्री एस० पी० भागवत होंगे, जिनका मुख्यालय इन्दौर में होगा और उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिकरण को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिये निर्देशित करती है ।

अनुसूची

क्या वेस्टर्न कोल फील्ड्स लिमिटेड की चुर्चा कोलियरी, डाकघर चुर्चा, जिला सरगुजा (मध्य प्रदेश) के प्रबन्धतन्त्र की, चुर्चा कोलियरी के भूमिगत लाडर श्री मोहम्मद अमीन का 7 जुलाई, 1973 से काम से रोकने की कार्यवाई न्यायोचित है ? यदि नहीं, तो उक्त कर्मकार किस अनुसूची का हकदार है ?

[संख्या एन०-22012/8/76-डी०-III(डी०)]

ORDER

New Delhi, the 2nd April, 1976

S.O. 2632.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of Churcha Colliery, Post Office Churcha Colliery, District Surguja (Madhya Pradesh) and their workmen in respect of the matter specified in the Schedule hereto annexed.

And, whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication.

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 7A, and clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10, of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby constitutes an Industrial Tribunal of which Shri S. P. Bhargava shall be the Presiding Officer, with headquarters at Indore and refers the said dispute for adjudication to the said Tribunal.

SCHEDULE

Whether the action of the management of Churcha Colliery of Western Coalfields Limited, Post Office Churcha, District Surguja (Madhya Pradesh) in stopping from work Sri Mohd. Amin, Underground Loader of Churcha Colliery with effect from 7-7-73 is justified ? If not, to what relief is the said workman entitled ?

[No. L-22012/8/76-D III(B)]

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 5 अप्रैल, 1976

क्र०आ० 2633.—केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि हमसे उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषयों के बारे में वेस्टर्न कोल फील्ड्स लिमिटेड की कटकोना कोलियरी, डाकघर कटकोना, जिला सरगुजा (मध्य प्रदेश) के प्रबन्धतन्त्र से संबंधित नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है ।

और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिये निर्देशित करना वाछनीय समझती है ।

अतः, अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 7क और धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एक औद्योगिक अधिकरण गठित करती है जिसके पीठासीन अधिकारी श्री एस० पी० भागवत होंगे, जिनका मुख्यालय इन्दौर होगा और उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिकरण को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिये निर्देशित करती है ।

अनुसूची

क्या वेस्टर्न कोल फील्ड्स लिमिटेड की कटकोना कोलियरी, डाकघर कटकोना, जिला सरगुजा (मध्य प्रदेश) के प्रबन्धतन्त्र की, सर्वश्री

बाबुराम पुत्र कनयाराम, जयनाथ पुत्र बोधन और रामसूभाग पुत्र भागीरथ को 22-9-75 से परवृत्त करने की कार्यवाई न्यायोचित है ? यदि नहीं तो उक्त कर्मकार किस अनुसूची का हकदार है ?

[सं० एन-22012/34/75-डी० III (बी०)]

ORDER

New Delhi, the 5th April, 1976

S.O. 2633.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of Katkona Colliery of Western Coalfields Limited, Post Office Katkona, District Surguja (Madhya Pradesh) and their workmen in respect of the matter specified in the Schedule hereto annexed.

And, whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication.

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 7A, and clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10, of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby constitutes an Industrial Tribunal of which Shri S. P. Bhargava shall be the Presiding Officer, with headquarters at Indore and refers the said dispute for adjudication to the said Tribunal.

SCHEDULE

Whether the action of the management of Katkona Colliery of Western Coalfields Limited, Post Office Katkona, District Surguja (Madhya Pradesh) in dismissing Sarva Shri Baburam son of Kanayaram, Jainath son of Bodhan and Ramsubhag son of Bhagirath with effect from 22-9-75 is justified ? If not, to what relief are the said workmen entitled ?

[No. L-22012/34/75-D III(B)]

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 23 अप्रैल, 1976

क्र०आ० 2634.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषयों के बारे में वेस्टर्न कोलफील्ड्स लिमिटेड के बुहरे सब एरिया की अमाली कोलियरी, डाकघर धनपुरी, जिला शाहडोल, के प्रबन्धतन्त्र से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है ,

और यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिये निर्देशित करना वाछनीय समझती है ।

अतः, अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 7क और धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (घ) द्वारा प्रवृत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा एक औद्योगिक अधिकरण गठित करती है जिसके पीठासीन अधिकारी श्री एस० पी० भागवत होंगे, जिनका मुख्यालय इन्दौर में होगा और उक्त विवाद को उक्त औद्योगिक अधिकरण को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिये निर्देशित करती है ।

अनुसूची

क्या वेस्टर्न कोलफील्ड्स लिमिटेड के बुहरे सब एरिया की अमाली कोलियरी, डाकघर धनपुरी, जिला शाहडोल के प्रबन्धतन्त्र की श्री बालेश्वर सुपुत्र श्री लोचन सोडर को 12-7-75 से काम से रोकने की कार्यवाई न्यायोचित है ? यदि नहीं, तो उक्त कर्मकार किस अनुसूची का हकदार है ?

[सं० एन०-22012/31/75-डी० III (बी०)]

ORDER

New Delhi, the 23rd April, 1976

S.O. 2634.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of Amali Colliery of Burhar Sub Area of Western Coalfields Limited, Post Office Dhanpuri, District Shahdol, and their workmen in respect of the matter specified in the Schedule hereto annexed.

And, whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication.

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 7A, and clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10, of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby constitutes an Industrial Tribunal of which Shri S. P. Bhargava shall be the Presiding Officer, with headquarters at Indore and refers the said dispute for adjudication to the said Tribunal.

SCHEDULE

Whether the action of the management of Amali Colliery of Burhar Sub Area of Western Coalfields Limited, Post Office Dhanpuri, District Shahdol in stopping from work Shri Baleshwar son of Lachan Loader, with effect from 12-7-75 is justified? If not, to what relief is the said workman entitled?

[No. L-22012/31/75/D-III(B)]

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 30 अप्रैल, 1976

का० आ० 2635.—इससे उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद श्री सुचेत सिंह कल्हा, पीठासीन अधिकारी, औद्योगिक अधिकरण, चंडीगढ़ के समक्ष लम्बित है।

और उक्त श्री सुचेत सिंह कल्हा की सेवाएं अब उपलब्ध नहीं हैं।

अतः, अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 7क और धारा 33-ख की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एक औद्योगिक अधिकरण गठित करती है, जिसके पीठासीन अधिकारी श्री प्रितपाल सिंह होंगे, जिनका मुख्यालय लुधियाना में होगा, और उक्त श्री सुचेत सिंह कल्हा के समक्ष लम्बित उक्त विवाद से सम्बन्धित कार्यवाहियों को वापस लेती है और इन्हें श्री प्रितपाल सिंह, पीठासीन अधिकारी, औद्योगिक अधिकरण, लुधियाना को उक्त कार्यवाहियों के निपटान के लिये इस निर्देश के साथ अन्तर्गत करती है कि उक्त अधिकरण उस प्रक्रम से कार्यवाहियों प्रारम्भ करेगा जिस पर ये इसे अन्तर्गत की गई है और इन्हे नियमानुसार निपटाएगा।

अनुसूची

| क्रम सं० | विवाद के पक्षकार | औद्योगिक विवाद की निर्देश संख्या और तारीख |
|----------|------------------|---|
|----------|------------------|---|

| | | |
|----|--|--|
| 1. | हिन्दुस्तान साहस लिमिटेड, जयपुर के प्रबन्धतन्त्र और उनके कर्मकार जिनका प्रतिनिधित्व तमक खान शमिक सच हैग मण्डी करता है। | एल०-29011/97/75-डी०-III (बी०), तारीख 23 अगस्त, 1975। |
|----|--|--|

[संख्या एल०-29011/97/75/डी०-III (बी०)]

एम० एच० एस० अय्यर, अनुभाग अधिकारी (विशेष)

ORDER

New Delhi, the 30th April, 1976

S. O. 2635.—Whereas the industrial dispute specified in the Schedule hereto annexed is pending before Shri Suchet Singh Kalha, Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Chandigarh.

And, whereas the services of the said Shri Suchet Singh Kalha are no longer available.

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 7A and sub-section (1) of section 33-B of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby constitutes an Industrial Tribunal of which Shri Pritpal Singh shall be the Presiding Officer, with headquarters at Ludhiana and withdraws the proceedings in relation to the said dispute ending before the said Shri Suchet Singh Kalha and transfers

the same to Shri Pritpal Singh, Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Ludhiana for the disposal of the said proceedings with the direction that the said Tribunal shall proceed with the proceedings from the stage at which it is transferred to it and dispose of the same according to law.

SCHEDULE

| Sl. No. | Parties to the dispute | Reference No. and date of Industrial dispute |
|---------|------------------------|--|
|---------|------------------------|--|

| | |
|---|---|
| Management of Hindustan Salts Limited, Jaipur and their workmen represented by the Salt Mines Labour Union, Diang, Mandi. | L. 29011/97/75-D. III(B) dated the 23rd August, 1975. |
|---|---|

[No. L-29011/97/75-D-III(B)]

S. H. S. IYER, Section Officer (Spl)

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 25 मार्च, 1976

का० आ० 2636.—केन्द्रीय सरकार को राय है कि इससे उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषय के बारे में सेंट्रल बैंक ऑफ इंडिया से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है।

और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिये निर्देशित करना वांछनीय समझती है।

अतः, अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 7क और धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के खंड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एक औद्योगिक अधिकरण गठित करती है जिसके पीठासीन अधिकारी श्री उपदेश नारायण माथुर होंगे, जिनका मुख्यालय जयपुर में होगा और उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिकरण को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिये निर्देशित करती है।

अनुसूची

क्या सेंट्रल बैंक ऑफ इंडिया की श्री एम० एल० खडेलवाल को, कोटा में अधिकारियों के कांडर में मुख्य कोषाध्यक्ष के पद पर पदोन्नति पर बदली का प्रस्ताव करने की कार्रवाई न्यायोचित है जबकि स्वयं जयपुर को अल्प शाखाओं में मुख्य कोषाध्यक्षों के पद रिक्त थे ? यदि नहीं, तो उक्त कर्मकार किस अनुसूची का हकदार है ?

[संख्या एल०-12012/160/75-डी-II(ए०)]

ORDER

New Delhi, the 25th March, 1976

S.O. 2636.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the Central Bank of India and their workmen in respect of the matter specified in the Schedule hereto annexed.

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication.

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 7A, and clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10, of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby constitutes an Industrial Tribunal of which Shri Updesh Narain Mathur shall be the Presiding Officer, with headquarters at Jaipur and refers the said dispute for adjudication to the said Tribunal.

SCHEDULE

Whether the action of the Central Bank of India in proposing transfer of Shri M. L. Khandelwal to Kota on promotion to the post of Chief Cashier in the officers Cadre, when there were vacancies of Chief Cashiers in other branches at Jaipur itself, is justified? If not to what relief is the said workmen entitled?

[No. L-12012/160/75-D-II(A)]

प्रवेश

नई दिल्ली, 7 मई, 1976

का० प्रा० 2637.—केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपाखण्ड अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषयों के बारे में कनारा बैंक से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारियों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है।

और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिये निर्देशित करना बांछनीय समझती है।

अतः, अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के खंड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7क के अधीन गठित औद्योगिक अधिकरण संख्या 2, मुम्बई की न्यायनिर्णयन के लिये निर्देशित करती है।

अनुसूची

क्या कनारा बैंक, मापुसा शाखा (गोवा) की, श्री शान्ताराम एन० सालेत्री चपरासी को 5 अक्टूबर, 1975 से काम से रोकने की कार्रवाई न्यायोचित है? यदि नहीं, तो उक्त कर्मकार किस अनुतोष का हकदार है?

[सं० एल०-12012/7/76-डी०-II(ए०)]

ORDER

New Delhi, the 7th May, 1976

S.O. 2637.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the Canara Bank and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed.

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication.

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal No. 2, Bombay, constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

Whether the action of the Canara Bank, Mapusa Branch (Goa) is stopping Shri Shantaram N. Saletri, Peon from work with effect from the 5th October, 1975 is justified? If not, to what relief is the said workman entitled?

[No. L-12012/7/76/DII(A)]

प्रवेश

का० प्रा० 2638.—केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपाखण्ड अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषय के बारे में विजय बैंक लिमिटेड के प्रबन्धतन्त्र से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारियों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है।

और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिये निर्देशित करना बांछनीय समझती है।

अतः, अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 7क और धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के खंड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एक औद्योगिक अधिकरण गठित करती है जिसके पीठासीन अधिकारी श्री जी० एस० भागवत होंगे, जिनका मुख्यालय बंगलूर में होगा और उक्त विवाद को उक्त औद्योगिक अधिकरण को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिये निर्देशित करती है।

अनुसूची

क्या विजय बैंक लिमिटेड, बंगलूर के प्रबन्धतन्त्र की, उक्त बैंक की शाखा नं० जी० रोड, बंगलूर में क्लर्क एवं गोदाम रक्षक श्री बी० सजंगा शेटी को 24 फरवरी, 1973 के अपराह्न से पदच्युत करने की कार्रवाई न्यायोचित है? यदि नहीं तो कर्मकार किस क्षतिपूर्ति का हकदार है?

[सं० एल०-12012/175/75-डी०-II(ए०)]

ORDER

S.O. 2638.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the Vijaya Bank Limited and their workman in respect of the matter specified in the Schedule hereto annexed.

And, whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication.

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 7A, and clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10, of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby constitutes an Industrial Tribunal of which Shri G. S. Bhagwat shall be the Presiding Officer, with headquarters at Bangalore and refers the said dispute for adjudication to the said Tribunal.

SCHEDULE

Whether the action of the management of Vijaya Bank Limited, Bangalore in dismissing Shri V. Bhajanga Shetty, Clerk-cum-Godown Keeper at the K. G. Road Branch of the said Bank, Bangalore with effect from the afternoon of the 24th February, 1973 is justified? If not, to what remedy is the said workman entitled?

[No. L-12012/175/75/DII(A)]

प्रवेश

नई दिल्ली, 11 मई, 1976

का० प्रा० 2639.—केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपाखण्ड अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषयों के बारे में पंजाब नेशनल बैंक से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारियों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है।

और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिये निर्देशित करना बांछनीय समझती है ;

अतः, अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के खंड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7क के अधीन गठित औद्योगिक अधिकरण, दिल्ली को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिये निर्देशित करती है।

अनुसूची

क्या पंजाब नेशनल बैंक, पश्चिम हिमालय क्षेत्र जम्मू के प्रबन्धतन्त्र की श्री किशोरी लाल, पोंग डैम क्षेत्र में भूतपूर्व अस्थायी कर्मचारी, की सेवाओं को 31 अगस्त, 1973 से समाप्त करने की कार्रवाई वैध और न्यायोचित है? यदि नहीं, तो उक्त कर्मकार किस अनुतोष का हकदार है?

[सं० एल०-12012/174/75-डी०-II(ए०)]

ORDER

New Delhi, the 11th May, 1976

S.O. 2639.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the Punjab National Bank and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication.

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal Delhi, constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

Whether the action of the management of the Punjab National Bank, West Himalayas Region Jammu in terminating the services of Shri Kishori Lal, ex-temporary employee in the Pong Dam Area with effect from the 31st August, 1973 is legal and justified? If not, to what relief is the said workman entitled?

[No. L-12012/174/75-D-II(A)]

आवेष्ट

का० प्रा० 2640—केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषयों के बारे में हिन्दुस्तान कमर्शियल बैंक लिमिटेड से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है ।

और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिये निर्देशित करना वांछनीय समझती है ।

अतः, अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10 की उप-धारा (1) के खंड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7क के अधीन गठित औद्योगिक अधिकरण, कलकत्ता को न्याय-निर्णयन के लिये निर्देशित करती है ।

अनुसूची

क्या हिन्दुस्तान कमर्शियल बैंक लिमिटेड के श्री विजय चन्ध कपूर लिपिक का कार्य करने रहे हैं । यदि हां, तो क्या उन्हें लिपिक के रूप में पदाभिहित किया जाना चाहिये और उसका नाम लिपिकों की वरिष्ठता सूची में लाया जाना चाहिये और किस तारीख में ?

[सं० एल०-12012/23/76-डी० II(ए०)]

ORDER

S.O. 2640.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the Hindustan Commercial Bank Limited and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed.

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable, to refer the said dispute for adjudication.

Now therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal Calcutta, constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

Whether Shri Bijoy Chand Kapoor of Hindustan Commercial Bank Limited has been performing the duties of a clerk ? If so, should he be designated as a clerk and his name brought on the seniority list of clerks and from what date ?

[No. L-12012/23/76/D.II(A)]

आवेष्ट

का० प्रा० 2641—केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषयों के बारे में बैंक ऑफ इंडिया से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है ।

और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिये निर्देशित करना वांछनीय समझती है ;

अतः, अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के खंड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7क के अधीन गठित औद्योगिक अधिकरण, दिल्ली को न्याय-निर्णयन के लिये निर्देशित करती है ।

अनुसूची

क्या बैंक ऑफ इंडिया के प्रबन्धनन्त की, लखनऊ स्थित उक्त बैंक की मुख्य शाखा में क्लर्क श्री ए० के० कीर्ति को 12 दिसम्बर, 1973 से पदभ्युत करने की कार्यवाही न्यायोचित है ? यदि नहीं, तो उक्त कर्मकार किस अनुसूच का हकदार है ?

[सं० एल०-12012/82/75-डी०-II(ए०)]

ORDER

S.O. 2641.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the Bank of India and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed.

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication,

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal, Delhi, constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

Whether the action of the management of the Bank of India in dismissing Shri A. K. Kirti, Clerk, Main Branch of the said Bank at Lucknow with effect from the 12th December, 1973 is justified ? If not, to what relief is the said workman entitled ?

[No. L-12012/82/75/D-II(A)]

आवेष्ट

नई दिल्ली, 17 मई, 1976

का० प्रा० 2642—केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषयों के बारे में न्यू इंडिया एशोर्स कम्पनी लिमिटेड, पटना के प्रबन्धनन्त से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है ;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिये निर्देशित करना वांछनीय समझती है ।

अतः, अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10 की उप-धारा (1) के खंड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7क के अधीन गठित औद्योगिक अधिकरण, धनबाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिये निर्देशित करती है ।

अनुसूची

क्या न्यू इंडिया एशोर्स कम्पनी लिमिटेड, पटना का श्री के० एन० चौबे सहायक निरीक्षक की सेवाओं को 7 मार्च, 1974 से समाप्त करना न्यायोचित था ? यदि नहीं, तो उक्त कर्मकार किस अनुसूच का हकदार है ?

[सं० एल०-17012/7/74-एल० आर० I]

आर० कुंजीथपदम, अवर सचिव

ORDER

New Delhi, the 17th May, 1976

S.O. 2642.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the New India Assurance Company Limited, Patna and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed.

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication.

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal, Dhanbad, constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

Whether the termination of services of Shri K N. Chaubey, Assistant Inspector, New India Assurance Company Limited, Patna with effect from the 7th March, 1974 was justified ? If not, to what relief is the said workman entitled ?

[No. L. 17012/7/74/LR I]

R. KUNJITHAPADAM, Under Secy.

आदेश

का० आ० 2643.—केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषयों के बारे में मैमर्स बी०सी०सी० लिमिटेड, की बारोरा कोलियरी के डायमण्ड फुलारीटाड सेक्शन डाकबर नवागढ़, जिला धनबाद से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है।

और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिये निर्देशित करना वांछनीय समझती है।

अतः, अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10 की उप-धारा (1) के खंड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7क के अधीन गठित केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण एवं श्रम न्यायालय संख्या 3 को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिये निर्देशित करती है।

अनुसूची

क्या मैमर्स बी०सी०सी० लिमिटेड, की बारोरा कोलियरी के डायमण्ड फुलारीटाड सेक्शन, डाकबर नवागढ़, जिला धनबाद के प्रबन्धतन्त्र की श्री योगेश्वर प्रसाद, रजिस्टर कीपर को 1/2/1973 से काम से रोकने की कार्रवाई उचित है ? यदि नहीं तो कर्मकार किम अनुत्तरेण का हकदार है ?

[म० एल०-20012/124/75-डी०-III-ए]

ORDER

S.O. 2643—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the Diamond Phularitand section of Barora Colliery of M/s. BCC Ltd., P.O. Nawagarh, Distt. Dhanbad and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court No. 3 constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

Whether the action of the management of Diamond Phularitand section of Barora Colliery of M/s. BCC Ltd., P.O. Nawagarh, Distt. Dhanbad in stopping from work of Shri Yogeshwar Prasad, Register Keeper with effect from 1st February, 1973 is justified ? If not, to what relief is the workman entitled ?

[No. L-20012/124/75-DIII-A]

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 3 अप्रैल, 1976

का० आ० 2644.—केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषयों के बारे में मैमर्स भारत कोकिंग कोल लिमिटेड की कानकानी कोलियरी, डाकबर बंसजोरा, धनबाद के प्रबन्धतन्त्र से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिये निर्देशित करना वांछनीय समझती है ;

अतः, अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10 की उप-धारा (1) के खंड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7क के अधीन गठित केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण एवं श्रम न्यायालय संख्या 2, धनबाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिये निर्देशित करती है।

47 GI/76-6

अनुसूची

क्या मैमर्स भारत कोकिंग कोल लिमिटेड की कानकानी कोलियरी, डाकबर बंसजोरा, जिला धनबाद के प्रबन्धतन्त्र की श्री राजेन्द्र सिंह जगपाल, विद्युत् सहायक को 26-8-1975 से पदच्युत करने की कार्रवाई वैध और न्यायोचित है ? यदि नहीं, तो वह किस अनुत्तरेण का हकदार है ?

[म० एल०-20012/240/75-डी०-III-ए]

ORDER

New Delhi, the 3rd April, 1976

S.O. 2644.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of Kankanee Colliery of M/s. Bharat Coking Coal Ltd., P.O. Bansjora, Dhanbad and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court No. 2, Dhanbad under section 7A of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

Whether the action of the management of Kankanee Colliery of M/s. Bharat Coking Coal Limited, P.O. Bansjora, District Dhanbad in dismissing Shri Rajendra Singh Jagpal, Electric Helper with effect from 26th August, 1975 is legal and justified ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

[No. L-20012/240/75-D.III-A]

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 21 अप्रैल, 1976

का० आ० 2645.—केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषयों के बारे में मैमर्स बी०सी०सी० लिमिटेड की निचिंतपुर कोलियरी के प्योर निचिंतपुर सेक्शन, डाकबर बंसजोरा, जिला धनबाद से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना वांछनीय समझती है;

अतः, अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10 की उप-धारा (1) के खंड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7क के अधीन गठित केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण एवं श्रम न्यायालय संख्या 3, धनबाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है।

अनुसूची

क्या मैमर्स भारत कोकिंग कोल लिमिटेड की निचिंतपुर कोलियरी के प्योर निचिंतपुर सेक्शन, डाकबर बंसजोरा, जिला धनबाद के प्रबन्धतन्त्र की श्री तदन कुमार मिश्र, विक्रय-पर्यवेक्षक की सेवाओं को 11-5-1972 से रोकने की कार्रवाई न्यायोचित है? यदि नहीं, तो कर्मकार किस अनुत्तरेण का हकदार है ?

[म० एल०-20012/126/75-डी०-III-ए]

ORDER

New Delhi, the 21st April, 1976

S.O. 2645.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the Pure Nichitpur Section of Nichitpur Colliery of M/s. B.C.C. Ltd., P.O. Bansjora, Distt. Dhanbad and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court No. 3, Dhanbad constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

Whether the action of the management of Pure Nichitpur Section of Nichitpur Colliery of M/s. Bharat Coking Coal Ltd., P.O. Bansjora, Distt. Dhanbad in stopping the services of Shri Tarun Kumar Mitra, Sale Supervisor with effect from 11th May, 1973 is justified? If not, to what relief is the workman entitled.

[No. L-20012/126/75-D.III-A]

आदेश

कां.प्र. 2646.—केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषयों के बारे में मैसर्स भारत कोकिंग कोल लिमिटेड, की नाथ तिसरा कोयला खान, डाकघर खास जीनागोरा, जिला धनबाद के प्रबंधतंत्र से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना बांछनीय समझती है;

अतः, अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10 की उप-धारा (1) के खण्ड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7क के अधीन गठित केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण-एवं-श्रम न्यायालय संख्या 3, धनबाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है।

अनुसूची

क्या मैसर्स भारत कोकिंग कोल लिमिटेड की नाथ तिसरा कोयला खान, डाकघर खास जीनागोरा, जिला धनबाद के प्रबंधतंत्र की सर्वश्री खालजीत मल्लाह और बलदेव मल्लाह, साफ्ट कोक भट्टा मेकरस् को नियमित न करने की कार्रवाई न्यायोचित है ? यदि नहीं, तो उक्त कर्मकार किस अनुसूच के हकदार हैं और किस तारीख से ?

[सं. एल-20012/164/75-डी-III-ए]

ORDER

S.O. 2646.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of North Tisra Colliery of M/s. Bharat Coking Coal Ltd., P.O. Khas Jeenagora, Distt. Dhanbad and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government

hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court No. 3, Dhanbad constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

Whether the action of the management of North Tisra Colliery of M/s. Bharat Coking Coal Limited, P.O. Khas Jeenagora, Distt. Dhanbad in not regulating S/Shri Lalji Mallah and Baldeo Mallah, Soft Coke Bhatta Makers is justified? If not, to what relief are the said workmen entitled and from what date?

[No. L-20012/164/75-D.III-A]

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 10 मई, 1976

कां.प्र. 2647.—केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषयों के बारे में मैसर्स कोल माईन्स अथॉरिटी लिमिटेड (अब कोल इंडिया लि.) की केदला कोलियरी, डाकघर और जिला हजारीबाग के प्रबंधतंत्र से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना बांछनीय समझती है,

अतः, अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7क के अधीन गठित केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण-एवं-श्रम न्यायालय संख्या 3, धनबाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है।

अनुसूची

क्या मैसर्स कोल माईन्स अथॉरिटी लि. की केदला कोलियरी, डाकघर और जिला हजारीबाग के प्रबंधतंत्र की, केदला कोलियरी के ठेकेदार श्री मदन शूक्ला के प्रेषण अधिकारी श्री चन्द्र नारायण झा को केदला कोलियरी में रोजगार देने से इंकार करने की कार्रवाई न्यायोचित है ? यदि नहीं, तो कर्मकार किस अनुसूच का और किस तारीख से हकदार है ?

[सं. एल-20012/160/75-डी-III-ए]

ORDER

New Delhi, the 10th May, 1976

S.O. 2647.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of Kedla Colliery of M/s. Coal Mines Authority Limited (Now Coal India Ltd.) P.O. & Distt. Hazaribagh and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court No. 3, Dhanbad constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

Whether the action of the management of Kedla Colliery of M/s. Coal Mines Authority Limited, P.O. and Distt. Hazaribagh in refusing employment to Shri

Chandra Narain Jha, Despatch Officer of Shri Madan Shukla a contractor in Kedla Colliery is justified? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled and from what date.

[No. L-20012/160/75/D.III-A]

आदेश

कां० 2648.—केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषयों के बारे में मैसर्स भारत कोकिंग कोल लि० की जोगिडिह कोलियरी के नार्थ सेनेडिह अनुभाग, डाकघर दुंडू, जिला धनबाद के प्रबंधन से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारियों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना वांछनीय समझती है;

अतः, अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10 की उप-धारा (1) के खण्ड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7क के अधीन गठित केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण-एवं-श्रम न्यायालय संख्या 2, धनबाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है।

अनुसूची

क्या मैसर्स भारत कोकिंग कोल लिमिटेड की जोगिडिह कोलियरी के नार्थ सेनेडिह अनुभाग, डाकघर दुंडू, जिला धनबाद के प्रबंधन की, सर्वश्री मूरली महतो, मोहन बोरु, अमृत बोरु, राधू मेहतो, मुखरू दाम, ठाकुर मोदी, राम कृष्ण बोरु और कुमुद मेहतो, सभी खनिकों को 26 जून, 1974 से पदच्युत करने की कार्रवाई न्यायोचित है? यदि नहीं तो संबंधित कर्मकार किस अनुतोष के हकदार है।

[सं० एल-20012/213/75-डी० III-ए]

ORDER

S.O. 2648.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of North Senedih Section of the Jogidih Colliery of M/s. Bharat Coking Coal Ltd., P.O. Tundoo, Distt. Dhanbad and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court No. 2, Dhanbad constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

Whether the action of the management of North Senedih Section of Jogidih Colliery of M/s. Bharat Coking Coal Limited, P.O. Tundoo, Distt. Dhanbad in dismissing the services of S/Shri Murali Mahato, Mohun Bouri, Amrit Bouri, Radhu Mahato, Mukhru Dass, Thakur Modi, Ram Kishen Bouri and Kumud Mahato all Miners with effect from 26th June, 1974 is justified? If not, to what relief are the workmen concerned entitled?

[No. L-20012/238/75-D. III-A]

आदेश

कां० 2649.—केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषयों के बारे में मैसर्स भारत कोकिंग कोल लिमिटेड, की जोगिडिह कोलियरी, डाकघर दुंडू, जिला धनबाद के प्रबंधन से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारियों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना वांछनीय समझती है;

अतः, अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10 की उप-धारा (1) के खण्ड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7क के अधीन गठित केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण-एवं-श्रम न्यायालय संख्या 3, धनबाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है।

अनुसूची

क्या मैसर्स भारत कोकिंग कोल लिमिटेड की जोगिडिह कोलियरी, डाकघर दुंडू, जिला धनबाद के प्रबंधन की, श्री लालू मेहतो, पम्प खलासी को 26-7-1974 से काम से रोकने की कार्रवाई न्यायोचित है? यदि नहीं, तो कर्मकार किस अनुतोष का हकदार है?

[संख्या एल-20012/238/75-डी०-III-ए]

ORDER

S.O. 2649.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of Jogidih Colliery of M/s. Bharat Coking Coal Limited, P.O. Tundoo, Distt. Dhanbad and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court No. 3, Dhanbad constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

Whether the action of the management of Jogidih Colliery of Messrs Bharat Coking Coal Limited, Post Office Tundoo District Dhanbad in stopping Shri Laloo Mahato, Pump Khalasi from his work with effect from 26-7-1974 is justified? If not, to what relief is the workman entitled?

[No. L-20012/238/75-D. III-A]

आदेश

कां० 2650.—केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषयों के बारे में मैसर्स भारत कोकिंग कोल लिमिटेड की कूरीडिह कोलियरी, डाकघर सोनारडिह, जिला धनबाद के प्रबंधन से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारियों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना वांछनीय समझती है;

अतः, अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7क के अधीन गठित केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण-एवं-श्रम न्यायालय संख्या 3, धनबाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है।

अनुसूची

क्या कर्मकार श्री सी० एम० तिवारी द्वारा काफी लम्बे समय से की गई झुट्टी को ध्यान में रखते हुए, मैसर्स भारत कोकिंग कोल लिमिटेड

की कूरीडिह कोलियरी के प्रबंधन की श्री सी०एम० तिवारी, लोडिंग चपरासी को लोडिंग क्लर्क का पदनाम और वेतनमान देने से इंकार करने की कार्यवाही न्यायोचित है? यदि नहीं, तो कर्मकार किम अनुतोष का हकदार है और किम तारीख से?

[सं० एल-20012/268/75-डी० III-ए]

ORDER

S.O. 2650.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of Kooridih Colliery of M/s. Bharat Coking Coal Ltd., Post Office Sonardih, District Dhanbad and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court No. 3, Dhanbad constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

Whether keeping in view the duties performed over a long period of time by the workman Shri C. S. Tewary, the action of the management of the Kooridih Colliery of Messrs Bharat Coking Coal Limited in denying the designation and scale of pay of Loading Clerk to Shri C. S. Tewary Loading Chaprasi, is justified? If not, to what relief is the workman entitled and from what date?

[No. L-20012/268/75/DIII-A]

आदेश

का०आ० 2651.—केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपावद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषयों के बारे में मैसर्स भारत कोकिंग कोल लिमिटेड की डोबारी कोयला खान, डाकघर झरिया, जिला धनबाद के प्रबंधन से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना वांछनीय समझती है;

अतः, अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10 की उप-धारा (1) के खण्ड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7क के अधीन गठित केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण-एवं-श्रम न्यायालय संख्या 3, धनबाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है।

अनुसूची

क्या मैसर्स भारत कोकिंग कोल लिमिटेड की डोबारी कोयला खान, डाकघर झरिया, जिला धनबाद के प्रबंधन की, श्री वनरथ हरिजन को 13-10-75 से मजदूर के रूप में काम करने की अनुमति देने से इंकार करने की कार्यवाही न्यायोचित है? यदि नहीं, तो उक्त कर्मकार किम अनुतोष का हकदार है?

[सं० एल-20012/16/76-डी० III-ए]

ORDER

S.O. 2651.—Where the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of Dobari Colliery of M/s. Bharat Coking Coal Ltd. Post Office Jharia, District Dhanbad and

their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court No. 3, Dhanbad constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

Whether the action of the management of Dobari Colliery of Messrs Bharat Coking Coal Limited, Post Office Jharia, Distt. Dhanbad in refusing to allow Shri Dasrath Harijan to work as Prop. Mazdoor with effect from 13-10-75 is justified? If not to what relief is the said workman entitled?

[No. L-20012/16/76/DIIIA]

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 17 मई, 1976

का०आ० 2652.—केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपावद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषयों के बारे में मैसर्स ईस्टर्न कोलफील्ड्स लिमिटेड की कापासारा कोयला खान, डाकघर मुग्मा, जिला धनबाद के प्रबंधन से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना वांछनीय समझती है;

अतः, अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7क के अधीन गठित केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण-एवं-श्रम न्यायालय संख्या 2, धनबाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है।

अनुसूची

क्या मैसर्स ईस्टर्न कोलफील्ड्स लिमिटेड की कापासारा कोयला खान, डाकघर मुग्मा, जिला धनबाद के प्रबंधन की, श्री बलराम कुमार उपपल, मुन्शी को 5 फरवरी, 1974 से काम से रोकने की कार्यवाही न्यायोचित है, यदि नहीं, तो उक्त कर्मकार किम अनुतोष का हकदार है?

[सं० एल-20012/154/75-डी० III-ए]

ORDER

New Delhi, the 17th May, 1976

S.O. 2652.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of Kapasara Colliery of M/s. Eastern Coalfields Limited, P.O. Mugma, District Dhanbad and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court No. 2, Dhanbad constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

Whether the action of the management of Kapasara Colliery of Messrs Eastern Coalfields Limited Post

Office Mugma District Dhanbad in stopping Shri Balram Kumar Uppal Munshi from work with effect from 5th February, 1974 is justified? If not to what relief is the said workman entitled?

[No. L-20012/154/75/D.IIIA]

प्रादेश

नई दिल्ली, 30 जून, 1976

कां० 2653.—केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपायद्वय अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषयों के बारे में मैसर्स भारत कोकिंग कोल लिमिटेड की दामोदा कोलियरी, डाकघर नवागढ़ जिला धनबाद के प्रबंधसंज्ञ से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारियों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना बाधनीय समझती है;

अतः, अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7क के अधीन गठित केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण एवं श्रम न्यायालय संख्या 3, धनबाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है।

अनुसूची

(1) क्या रामगढ़ झरिया कोलियरी जो अब मैसर्स भारत कोकिंग कोल लिमिटेड की दामोदा कोलियरी डाकघर-करमाटाड द्वारा मोहुदा जिला धनबाद की एक यूनिट है, के प्रबंधसंज्ञ की जनवरी, 1973 में कोयला खान को सरकार के अधीन ले लेने और उस कोयला खान में मार्च, 1973 में खनन कार्य पुनः चालू करने के पश्चात् श्री मोहन माकारु कुस को नियोजित न करने की कार्रवाई न्यायोचित है? यदि नहीं, तो कर्मकार किस अनुतोष का हकदार है और किस तारीख से?

(2) क्या मैसर्स भारत कोकिंग कोल लिमिटेड, की दामोदा कोलियरी, डाकघर करमाटाड, द्वारा मोहुदा जिला धनबाद के प्रबंधसंज्ञ की दामोदा कोयला खान के करमाटाड सेक्शन में श्री राजू राउत, कर्मकार कमिश्नर सिरदार को 28 फरवरी, 1973 से कार्य से रोकने की कार्रवाई न्यायोचित थी? यदि नहीं, तो कर्मकार किस अनुतोष का हकदार है?

[सं एल-20012/274/75-डी III-ए]

आर० पी० नरुला, अवर सचिव

ORDER

New Delhi, the 30th June, 1976

S.O. 2653.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of Damoda Colliery of M/s. Bharat Coking Coal Ltd. P. O. Nawagarh District Dhanbad and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court No. 3 Dhanbad constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

(1) Whether the action of the management of Ramgarh Jahria Colliery now a unit of Damoda Colliery of Messrs Bharat Coking Limited Post Office Karmatand Via Mohuda District Dhanbad in not employing Shri Mohan Makaru Kuru after the take over of the Colliery in January, 1973 and restarting the mining operations in that colliery in March 1973 is justified? If not, to what relief is the workman entitled and from what date?

(2) Whether the action of the management of Damoda Colliery of Messrs Bharat Coking Coal Limited, P. O. Karmatand, via Mohuda District Dhanbad in stopping from work Shri Raju Raut, workman-cum-commissioned Sirdar, Karmatand section of Damoda Colliery with effect from 28th February, 1973 was justified? If not, to what relief is the workman entitled?

[L-20012/274/75-D.IIIA]

R. P. NARULA, Under Secy.

प्रादेश

नई दिल्ली, 3 मई, 1976

कां० 2654.—केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपायद्वय अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषयों के बारे में मैसर्स एस० आर० पुसलकर एण्ड कम्पनी, मुम्बई के प्रबंधसंज्ञ से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारियों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना बाधनीय समझती है;

अतः, अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7क के अधीन गठित केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण संख्या 2, मुम्बई को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है।

अनुसूची

क्या मैसर्स एस० आर० पुसलकर एण्ड कम्पनी, नेशनल सीमेन्ट यूनियन बिल्डिंग 4, गोवा स्ट्रीट, फोर्ट, बम्बई-400001 के प्रबंधसंज्ञ की श्री मूदबीद्री पदमनाभा प्रभु की सेवाओं को 20 सितम्बर, 1971 से मौखिक रूप से समाप्त करने की कार्रवाई न्यायोचित है? यदि नहीं तो कर्मकार किस अनुतोष का हकदार है?

[सं एल-31012/3/76-डी-4 (ए)]

ORDER

New Delhi, the 3rd May, 1976

S.O. 2654.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of Messrs S. R. Pusalkar and Company Bombay and their workman in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d), of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Central Government Industrial Tribunal No. 2, Bombay constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

Whether the action of the Management of Messrs S. R. Pusalkar and Company, National Seamen's Union Building, 4, Goa Street, Fort, Bombay-400001, in orally terminating the services of Shri Moodbidri Padmanabha Prabhu with effect from 20th September, 1971 is justified? If not, to what relief is the workman entitled?

[No. L. 31012/3/76/D. IV(A)]

प्रादेश

नई दिल्ली, 6 मई, 1976

कां० 2655.—केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपायद्वय अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषयों के बारे में मैसर्स विसम मुम्बई के प्रबंधसंज्ञ से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारियों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना बांछनीय समझती है;

अतः, अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10 की उप-धारा (1) के खण्ड (क) द्वारा प्रवृत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7क के अधीन गठित केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण मुम्बई संख्या 2 को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है।

अनुसूची

क्या मैसर्स विंसंस इम्पीरियल चैम्बरस, विल्सन रोड, डाक पेटी संख्या 1601, बेल्लार् एस्टेट, मुम्बई-400038 के प्रबंधक श्री, श्री रमेश एल० नारियानी, सीमा शुल्क लिपिक की सेवाएं 23 सितम्बर, 1975 से समाप्त करने और उन्हें प्रबन्धक और परिवहन और गोदी श्रमिक नियुक्त, मुम्बई के बीच तारीख 10 सितम्बर, 1969 के समझौते में यथा उपबंधित वेतन और भत्तों से संबंधित करने की कार्यवाई न्यायोचित है? यदि नहीं, तो कर्मकार किस अनुतोष का हकदार है?

[संख्या एल-31012(5)/76-डी-4 (ए)]

ORDER

New Delhi, the 6th May, 1976

S.O. 2655.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of Messrs Vinsons, Bombay and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Bombay No. 2 constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

Whether the action of the management of Messrs Vinsons, Imperial Chambers, Wilson Road, P. O. Box No. 1601, Ballard Estate, Bombay-400038 in terminating the services of Shri Ramesh L. Nariani, Custom Clerk, with effect from 23rd September, 1975 and in denying him the salary and allowances as provided in the Settlement dated 10th September, 1969 between the management and the Transport and Dock Workers' Union, Bombay is justified? If not, to what relief is the workman entitled?

[No. L-31012(5)/76-D, IV(A)]

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 10 मई, 1976

का०आ० 2656.—केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषयों के बारे में मैसर्स बीगले एण्ड कम्पनी प्राइवेट लिमिटेड, मोरमुगाओ हार्बर-गोवा के प्रबंधक से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना बांछनीय समझती है;

अतः, अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (क) द्वारा प्रवृत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7क के अधीन गठित केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण संख्या 2, मुम्बई को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है।

अनुसूची

क्या मैसर्स बीगले एण्ड कम्पनी (प्रा०) लिमिटेड, गोवा के मैकेनिकल और हैंडलिंग प्लांट में नियोजित श्रमिकों की गोदी और पतन श्रमिकों के लिए केन्द्रीय मजदूरी बोर्ड की सिफारिशों पर संशोधित वेतनमानों के कारण समायोजन भत्तों में हुए अन्तर के भुगतान की मांग न्यायोचित है? यदि हाँ, तो संबंधित कर्मकार किस अनुतोष के हकदार है?

[सं० एल-36011/10/75-डी 4(ए)]

नन्द लाल, अनुभाग अधिकारी (विशेष)

ORDER

New Delhi, the 10th May, 1976

S.O. 2656.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of Messrs Chowgule and Company Private Limited, Mormugao Harbour-Goa and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, No. 2, Bombay, constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

Whether the demand of the workmen employed at the Mechanical Ore Handling Plant of Messrs Chowgule and Company (Private) Limited, Goa for payment of difference of overtime allowance arising out of the scales of pay revised on the recommendations of the Central Wage Board for Port & Dock Workers, is justified. If so, to what relief are the workmen concerned entitled?

[No. L-36011(10)/75-D, IV(A)]

NAND LAL, Section Officer (Spl.)

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 21 मई, 1976

का०आ० 2657.—केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषयों के बारे में भाखड़ा प्रबन्ध बोर्ड के प्रबंधक से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना बांछनीय समझती है;

अतः, अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 7क और धारा 10 की उप-धारा (1) के खण्ड (ब) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एक औद्योगिक अधिकरण गठित करती है जिसके पीठासीन अधिकारी श्री प्रितपाल सिंह होंगे, जिनका मुख्यालय लुधियाना में होगा, और उक्त विवाद को उक्त औद्योगिक अधिकरण को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्दिष्ट करती है।

धनुसूची

क्या भाखड़ा प्रबन्ध बोर्ड, नगल टाउनशिप के प्रबंधन की, श्री रोशन लाल, श्री बचन सिंह और श्री देवराज, सर्वोच्च न्यायालयों की सेवाओं को 30-9-1975 से समाप्त करने की कार्रवाई बंध और न्यायो-नित है? यदि नहीं, तो उक्त कर्मकार किस अनुसूची के हकदार हैं?

[सं० एल-42012/3/76-डी-II (की)]

हरबंस बहादुर, धनुभाग अधिकारी (विशेष)

New Delhi, the 21st May, 1976

S.O. 2657.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of the Bhakra Management Board and their workmen in respect of the matter specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication.

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 7A and clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10, of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby constitutes an industrial Tribunal of which Shri Pritpal Singh shall be the Presiding Officer, with headquarters at Ludhiana and refers the said dispute for adjudication to the said Tribunal.

THE SCHEDULE

Whether the action of the management of the Bhakra Management Board, Nagal Township, in terminating the services of Shri Roshan Lal, Shri Bachan Singh and Shri Dev Raj, Survey Khalasi, with effect from, 30-9-1975, is legal and justified? If not, to what relief are the said workmen entitled?

[No. L. 42012/3/76/DII(B)]

HARBANS BAHADUR, Section Officer (Spl.)

नई दिल्ली, 25 जून, 1976

क्रा०सा० 2658.—चूना पत्थर और डोलोमाइट खान श्रम कल्याण निधि नियम, 1973 के नियम 5 के उपनियम (2) के साथ पठित चूना पत्थर और डोलोमाइट खान श्रम कल्याण निधि अधिनियम, 1972 (1972 का 62) की धारा 8 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए और भारत सरकार के श्रम मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना सं० ए-11011/2/75/एम तारीख 11-11-1975 और सं० एस-23012/1/75 एम तारीख 27-1-1976 का आंशिक उपाखरण करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार, नीचे दी हुई सारणी के स्तम्भ 2 में निर्दिष्ट व्यक्तियों को, उक्त सारणी के स्तम्भ 4 में की तत्संबंधी प्रविष्टि में निर्दिष्ट राज्यों में इस

अधिनियम के प्रयोजनार्थ चूना पत्थर और डोलोमाइट कल्याण तथा उपकर आयुक्त के रूप में नियुक्त करती है।

सारणी

| क्रम सं० | अधिकारी का नाम और पदनाम | मुख्यालय | उनकी अधिकारिता के भीतर के राज्यों के नाम |
|----------|---|--------------|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 1. | श्री के० डी० हजेल्ला चूना पत्थर और डोलोमाइट खान कल्याण तथा उपकर आयुक्त। | करमा (बिहार) | बिहार, उत्तर प्रदेश, जम्मू कश्मीर तथा दिल्ली संघ राज्य क्षेत्र। |
| 2. | श्री एन० एल० शर्मा चूना पत्थर और डोलोमाइट खान कल्याण और उपकर आयुक्त। | भिलवारा | राजस्थान, गुजरात, हरियाणा, पंजाब और हिमाचल प्रदेश। |

[सं० एस-23013/3/75 एम की]
सी० आर० निम, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 25th June, 1976

S. O. 2658.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of the section 8 of the Limestone and Dolomite Mines Labour Welfare Fund Act, 1972 (62 of 1972), read with sub-rule (5) of rule 2 of the Limestone and Dolomite Mines Labour Welfare Fund Rules, 1973 and in partial modification of the Notifications of Government of India in the Ministry of Labour No. A-11011/2/75-MV, dated the 11th November, 1975 and No. S-23012/1/75-MV, dated the 27th January, 1976, the Central Government appoints each of the Officers mentioned in column 2, of the Table below to be Limestone and Dolomite Mines Welfare and Cess Commissioner for the purpose of this Act in the States specified in the corresponding entry in column 4 of the said Table.

TABLE

| Sl. No. | Name and Designation of the Officer | Headquarter | Name of States in their jurisdiction |
|---------|--|---------------|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 1. | Shri K. D. Hajela, Limestone and Dolomite Mines Welfare and Cess Commissioner. | Karma (Bihar) | Bihar, Uttar Pradesh, Jammu and Kashmir and Union Territory of Delhi. |
| 2. | Shri N. L. Sharma, Limestone and Dolomite Mines Welfare and Cess Commissioner. | Bhilwara. | Rajasthan, Gujarat, Haryana and Himachal Pradesh. |

[No. S-23013/3/75-MV.]

C. R. NIM, Under Secy.

New Delhi, the 26th June, 1976

S.O. 2659.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following the award of the Central

Government Industrial Tribunal, (No. 2), Dhanbad in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Messrs M. N. Ghosh and Sons, Contractors of Gua Ore Mines of Messrs Indian Iron and Steel Company Limited, Gua and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 24th June, 1976.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL
TRIBUNAL (NO. 2) AT DHANBAD.

REFERENCE NO. 17 of 1974

In the matter of an industrial dispute u/s 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947

(Ministry's order No. L-26011/3/74-LR. IV dt. 10-6-74).

PARTIES : Employers in relation to the management of Messrs M. N. Ghosh and Sons, Contractors of Gua Ore Mine of Messrs Indian Iron and Steel Company Limited Post Office Gua, District Singhbhum.

AND

Their workmen.

APPEARANCES :

On behalf of the workmen.—Shri Lalit Burman.

On behalf of the employers.—Shri T. P. Choudhury,
Advocate.

STATE : Bihar **INDUSTRY :** Ore Mine
Dhanbad, 21st June, 1976.

AWARD

The issue framed in the order of reference in this case is as follows :

SCHEDULE

"Keeping in view the term No. 3 of the Tripartite Settlement dated the 26th April, 1973, whether Messrs M. N. Gosh and Sons, Contractors of Gua Ore Mine of Messrs Indian Iron and Steel Company Limited, Post office Gua, District Singhbhum was justified in denying wages @ Rs. 1.25 per tonne, Dearness Allowance @ Rs. 1.92 per tonne, Variable Dearness Allowance Rs. 15 P. M. as Food Grains Allowance in pursuance of terms No. 5(II), 6, 7 and 12 respectively of the aforesaid settlement to Truck Loaders employed under them ? If not, to what relief are the concerned workers entitled ?"

At the instance of the employers M/s. M. N. Ghosh & Sons Contractors of Gua Ore Mine, the preliminary objections were heard. The first objection raised before me is that the workmen themselves or the union on record never raised any industrial dispute with the employers M/s. M. N. Ghosh & Sons and as such the Reference is incompetent. It is submitted that they came to know about the demand of the workmen for the first time on getting a letter from the Assistant Labour Commissioner (Central) Chalbasa which is marked Ext. M1 with which the demand of the workmen was enclosed. The settled law on the point is that the specific dispute must

be raised with the employers first to make it an industrial dispute. Raising of dispute through the Assistant Labour Commissioner (C) who is the conciliation officer does not amount to raising industrial dispute with the employers. The workmen in their written statement assert that they raised the industrial dispute with the employers first, Ext. W. 2 is said to be the letter to the employers in this respect. MW 1 Sisir Kumar Ghosh, Partner of M/s. M. N. Ghosh & Sons deny having received the original of Ext. W.2. The issue and service of Ext. W. 2 on the employers have not been proved. Shri S. K. Rao the treasurer of the union says in his evidence as WW.1 that Ext.2 is the office copy of the union's letter dated 7-11-73 under the signature of Shri P. Mazumder, General Secretary of the union and the letter was sent under ordinary post. As the letter was not sent under registered post or under certificate of posting the issue of the same could have been proved otherwise. WW. 1 says that in the union office there is a receipt and despatch register. It could have been proved from the despatch register that Ext. W2 was actually issued from the office of the union but that was not done. It is further in his evidence that they maintain an account of postage for letters despatched. That has also not been produced. So no documentary evidence has been proved in respect of issue of this letter. Then again simply issue of letter is not enough. It must be served upon the employers. Regarding service, there is no evidence. WW. 1 does not say that apart from the letter Ext. W. 2, the dispute was raised otherwise. There is therefore no satisfactory evidence that industrial dispute was raised with the employers by any means. So on the basis of materials before me I can only say that the raising of industrial dispute with the management has not been satisfactorily proved. This makes the reference not maintainable.

The learned Advocate for the management then submits demand made is not in consonance with the issues framed in this Reference. I have not been shown what was the demand of the workmen and so it cannot at once be said that the demand of the workmen and the issue framed are different.

The learned Advocate for the management then submits that the tripartite settlement dated 26-4-73 was one between an INTUC Union and Indian Iron & Steel Co. The AITUC Union who has taken up the cause of the concerned workmen is required to prove that the concerned workmen belong to AITUC Union. As a matter of fact there was no evidence on either side in this respect nor argument in respect of law on the point was placed before me. If the case went to the stage of hearing on merit, I could have given a chance to the parties to place evidence and argument on the point of fact and law in this respect. Be that as it may, my finding is that no industrial dispute was raised according to law, which makes the reference incompetent.

In the result, I find that the reference is incompetent and not maintainable.

K. K. SARKAR, Presiding Officer

[No. L-26011(3)/74-LR. IV-D. IV(B)]

New Delhi, the 2nd July, 1976

S.O. 2660.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Jabalpur in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Messrs J. A. Trivedi Brothers, Balaghat and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 29th June, 1976.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL
TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, JABALPUR (M.P.)

CASE No. CGIT/LC(R) (35) OF 1974.

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Messrs. J. A. Trivedi Brothers, Balaghat and their workmen represented through the General Secretary, Samyukta

Khadan Mazdoor Sangh, Mazdoor Bhavan, Balaghat (M.P.)

APPEARANCES :

For Workmen.—Shri K. Nutneshwar, Secretary.
For management.—Shri S. D. Mukherji, Advocate.

INDUSTRY : Manganese Mine DISTRICT : Balaghat (M.P.)

AWARD

Government of India in the Labour Department vide its Order No. L-27012(2)/74-I.R.IV dated 17th December, 1974 has projected the following question for the adjudication of this Tribunal :—

"Whether the action of the management of Messrs. J.A. Trivedi Brothers, Balaghat in dismissing Srimati Mantura Bai, Permanent Piece-rated worker in their Ramrama Manganese Mine with effect from the 21st January, 1972 is justified ? If not, to what relief is the workman entitled ?"

2. The parties to the dispute have arrived at a settlement under which the management has paid Rs. 1000/- to Smt. Mantura Bai, workman, in full and final satisfaction of her claim and she has agreed not to press the dispute. The terms of the settlement have been verified today by the Secretary of the Union and the Counsel for the management. The reference is therefore answered accordingly. Copy of the settlement shall form part of this award.

23-6-1976. S. N. JOHRI, Presiding Officer

BEFORE THE PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVT.
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, JABALPUR.

Reference No. CGIT/LC(R)(35)/74 U/s 10 Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

PARTIES :

- (1) The management of M/s. J. A. Trivedi Brothers, Balaghat represented by Shri I. A. Trivedi.
- (2) For Workmen Shrimati Manturabai, represented by Shri K. Nutneshwar, Secretary, Samvukta Khadan Mazdoor Sangh, Balaghat.

SHORT RECITAL

Government of India, Ministry of Labour, New Delhi vide their letter dated the 17th December, 1974 have referred before the Hon'ble Court the following issue for adjudication :—

"Whether the action of the management of Messrs. J. A. Trivedi Brothers, Balaghat in dismissing Shrimati Mantura Bai, Permanent Piece-rated worker in their Ramrama Manganese Mine with effect from the 21st January, 1972 is justified ? If not, to what relief is the workman entitled ?"

TERMS OF SETTLEMENT

The above dispute which has been referred to the Hon'ble Court has been amicably settled between the Management of M/s. J. A. Trivedi Brothers, Balaghat represented by Shri R. A. Trivedi and workman Shrimati Mantura Bai, represented by Shri K. Nutneshwar, Secretary, Samyukta Khadan Mazdoor Sangh, Balaghat, as under :—

1. The management hereby agrees to pay to the workman Smt. Mantura Bai a sum of Rs. 1000/- (Rupees One thousand only) in full and final payment of her claim and which is agreed by the workman Smt. Mantura Bai.

2. The Management agrees to pay the said sum in a month's time from the date of the settlement.

3. The workman agrees to withdraw the above said dispute.

47GI/76—7

WITNESS :—

SIGNATURE OF THE PARTIES.

1. Sd/- Illegible.

Sd/- R. A. Trivedi

2. Sd/- Illegible

PARTY NO. 1 (Management)

Place : Balaghat :

Sd/- K. Nutneshwar

Dated : 14-2-1975.

14-2-1975

PARTY No. 2 for (Workman)

PART OF AWARD

(S. N. JOHRI, Presiding Officer.)

[No. L-27012/2/74-I.R. IV/D II(B)]
BHUPENDRA NATH, Section Officer (Spl.)

New Delhi, the 28th June, 1976

S.O. 2661.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal Calcutta-I, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Jote Janki Khas Colliery, P. O. Kajoragram, Distt. Burdwan and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 21st June 1976.

CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL
AT CALCUTTA.

Reference No. 42 of 1975

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Joti Janki Khas Colliery,

AND

Their Workmen.

APPEARANCE :

On behalf of Employers—Sri N. Das, Advocate, with Sri B. N. Lal, Asstt. Chief Personnel Officer, Sri M. Ghosh Chaudhuri, Group Personnel Officer & Sri S. C. Koar, Area Industrial Relations Officer.

On behalf of Workmen—Absent

STATE : West Bengal

INDUSTRY : Coal Mine

AWARD

By Order No. L-19012/23-73 I.R. II, dated 31-10-1974, the Government of India, Ministry of Labour, referred an industrial dispute existing between the employers in relation to the management of Jote Janki Khas Colliery and their workmen, to this Tribunal, for adjudication. The reference reads as :—

"Whether the management in relation to Jote Janki Khas Colliery, Post Office Tonsi, District Burdwan are justified in refusing employment to Sarvashri Ram Brich Yadav, Munshi, Harichandra Yadav, Night Guard, Md. Hussain, Driver, Ram Kumar Yadav, Jalil Ansari, B. Mazdoor, Asgar Ansari, B. Mazdoor, Mazur Alam, B. Mazdoor, Sadique Khan, P. Miner and Gafur Mia, P. Miner with effect from the 28th October, 1972 ? If not to what relief are the workmen entitled ?"

2. The Personnel Officer of the colliery concerned in this case has been examined to prove that the workmen under reference had no subsisting right to be employed in the colliery with effect from 28th October, 1972. However, workmen Svs. Ram Brich Yadav, Harish Ch. Yadav, Md. Hussain and Ram Kumar Yadav had been reinstated on other valid grounds. Those four workmen also filed a statement before this Tribunal that they are no longer concerned with the reference as they have no defence to make.

3. The rest of five workmen, namely Svs. Jalil Ansari, Asgar Ansari, Mazur Alam, Sadique Khan and Gafur Mia

are absent and they did not file any written statement. The management filed its written statement denying that these five workmen concerned have any claim to be reinstated as their workmen. The witness stated that they being casual labourers had abandoned their job long before the nationalisation of the coal mines came into force. So they cannot claim any title to the office they held previous to the nationalisation.

4. In the result, an award is passed against the workmen, Svs. Jaffi Ansari, Asgar Ansari, Mazur Alam, Sadique Khan and Gafur Mia to the effect that the management of Jote Lanki Khas Colliery was justified in refusing work to them with effect from 28th October, 1972 and the reference in relation to the workmen Svs. Ram Bich Yadav, Harichandra Yadav, Md. Hussain and Ram Kumar Yadav does not arise for consideration.

[No. I-29012/23/73-1 RII]

Sd/-

J. K. MOIDU, Presiding Officer

Dated Calcutta,

The 16th June, 1976

New Delhi, the 29th June, 1976

S.O. 2662.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal (No. 2) Dhanbad in the Industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management, of Sarvasri B. I. Newatia and I. D. Sarda, Mine owners, Post Office Chaibasa District Singhbhum and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 22nd June 1976.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (NO. 2) AT DHANBAD

Reference No. 33 of 1974

In the matter of an industrial dispute u/s 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

(Ministry's order No. L-29011(51)/74 LR. IV dated 17-12-1974).

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the managements of Sarvasri B. I. Newatia and I. D. Sarda Mine Owners, Post office Chaibasa District Singhbhum,

AND

Their workmen

APPEARANCES :

On behalf of B. I. Newatia : Shri M. M. Saha, Advocate.

On behalf of I. D. Sarda : Shri K. K. Sarda

On behalf of the workmen : None.

STATE : Bihar.

INDUSTRY : Lime Stone

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour, New Delhi sent the above reference to this Tribunal for adjudication of the industrial dispute involved with the following issues framed :

SCHEDULE

I Whether the demand for revision of wages by the workmen of Sarda Lime Stone Mines of Sri I. D. Sarda is justified ? If so, what should be the wage structure for various categories and with effect from what date ?

II. Whether the demand for revision of wages by the workmen of Kamaibatu Lime Stone Mines of Shri

B. I. Newatia is justified ? If so, what should be the wage structure of various categories and with effect from what date.

III. Whether the following demands by the aforesaid workmen are justified, namely :

(a) Issue of employment letters ;

(b) Grant of 4 paid festival holidays ;

(c) Grant of 16 days sick leave ;

If so, the relief they are entitled to and the date from which it is to operate.

On receipt of the reference notices were sent to the parties. The employers appeared and subsequently filed written statements. The case proceeded along its course. On 4-4-1975 the President of the union appeared and filed written statement. A series of dates were allowed to the parties on their prayer. Ultimately the case was fixed for evidence and argument of parties of 24-4-1976 and notices in respect of the same were issued to the parties. On 24-4-1976 none was present from the side of workmen nor any step was taken. It appears that since 4-4-1975 nons was present for the workmen nor any steps was taken by them. I have waited for the workmen for full one year but in vain. Sufficient chance was given to the workmen to contest the case. From the continued absence of the workmen I am inclined to believe that the workmen are no longer interested to prosecute their case as because they have no more any industrial disputes subsisting. Both the employers appeared on the date fixed for evidence and argument. Both the employers submit that since the workmen are not interested to prosecute their case, they are not also interested to prosecute their case. As they stand in the position of defendants, they do not have any industrial dispute to press in the absence of the applicants. Taking a stock of the whole position, I am inclined to believe that the parties have no longer any industrial dispute subsisting. In such circumstances I have no other alternative than to pass a 'no dispute' award.

In the result, I make a 'no-dispute' award in respect of the industrial dispute involved in this reference.

K. K. SARKAR, Presiding Officer.
[No. I-29011(51)/74-IR IV]

S.O. 2663.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal (No. 2) Dhanbad in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Katipara China Clay Mines of Messrs Maharaja Cossim bazar China Clay Mines (Private) Limited, P.O. Karanjia, Distt. Singhbhum and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 22nd June 1976.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (NO. 2) AT DHANBAD

Reference No. 27 of 1975

In the matter of an industrial dispute u/s 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947

Ministry's order No. I-29011/7/75-D.O. 3 (D) dated 15-3-1975)

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the Katipara China Clay Mines of Messrs Maharaja Cossimbazar China Clay Mines (Private) Limited, Post Office Karanjia Distt. Singhbhum.

AND

Their workmen

APPEARANCES .

On behalf of the employers : Shri A. M. Gupta.

On behalf of the workmen : Shri Mukund Ram Tanti, Deputy President, Singhbhum Sada Mitti Khan Avang Sambandhit Udyog Mazdoor Sangh, Singhbhum.

STATE : Bihar

INDUSTRY : China Clay Mines

AWARD

In the above reference the following issues were framed by the Government of India, Ministry of Labour, New Delhi, in their order of reference:

SCHEDULE

"Whether the demand for increase in wages by workmen of Katipara China Clay Mines of Messrs Maharaja Cossimbazar China Clay Mines (Private) Limited, Post office Karanjia, District Singhbhum, is justified? If so, what should be the wage structure and from what date?"

Shri Mukund Ram Tanti, who claims to be the Deputy President, Singhbhum Sada Mitti Khan Avang Sambandhit Udyog Mazdoor Sangh filed a statement or demand before this Tribunal. The gist of that is :

That the employers of M/s. Maharaja Cossimbazar China Clay Mines (P) Ltd. have been paying wages to different categories of employees in their china clay mines which are very meagre and starving wage rates. There is no wage structure or scale of pay category wise for different workmen. There exists discrimination in wages for male and female workmen. So it is prayed that fair wages for different workmen category wise in different grades according to workload and skill be fixed and abolish discrimination in wages between male and female workers.

Written statement on behalf of the management was filed which is shortly as follows :

There is a trade union under the name of Karanjia China Clay Mines (Orient Potteries) Workers Union at Chaibasa who represent the workmen of different mines including the instant china clay mine. In October, 1974 there was a fresh agreement with that INTUC Union registered No. 971 of which Shri R. C. Palliwal is the General Secretary and the said agreement was between the owners of the five China Clay Mines including the present one. The present management accepted all the terms in full of the said agreement which was duly implemented. That settlement is still in operation. A strike notice was served. The matter went into conciliation but the conciliation failed. It is further their case that the reference is not maintainable inasmuch as no dispute with regard to wage structure and introduction of wage structure from a particular date was raised by the workmen. These demands were not also raised before the Conciliation Officer. They also challenge the authority of the union on record to represent the workmen or raise an industrial dispute.

From the side of the employers a settlement between the management of some China Clay Mines and their workmen represented by Karanjia China Clay Mines (Orient Potteries) Workers Union dated 14-10-1974 has been filed (Ext. M1). As against the above settlement, Shri Mukund Ram Tanti, Deputy President of the union sponsoring the present dispute submits that that union is a pocket union of the employers and they always look to the interest of management. Of course this remains an allegation only without any proof before me. So I cannot hold in the absence of proof that Karanjia China Clay Mines (Orient Potteries) Workers Union was a non-entity or had no following. Mr. Tanti submits that the said union is dissolved and Shri Palliwal has gone over to Gur. Shri Tanti does not prove any papers before me to show that the said union has been dissolved. Shri G. P. Chatterjee deposing for the employers says on oath that Karanjia China Clay Mines (Orient Potteries) Workers Union still functions in their mines and Shri Mishal Jaha was the President and Shri R. C. Palliwal was the General Secretary. He prove the settlement Ext. M1. He proves another settlement dated 28-12-1975 (Ext. M2). He says

that they have implemented the settlement and workers are taking wages as per the settlement. He further says that the Labour Commissioner has given notice to some other mines for taking proper action against them as they have not implemented the last mentioned settlement. It is also in his evidence that the union never raised any dispute for fixation of wage structure or from which date it should take effect. It is submitted by the learned representative of the management that by the settlement of 14-10-1974 the minimum wage came to Rs. 2.75 and by the settlement dated 28-12-1975 the wages came to Rs. 3.00 per day. Shri Mukund Ram Tanti submits that minimum wage of Rs. 3.00 was then demand when they raised the dispute but he submits that female workers are paid less and this difference should be abolished. I can only express my view that there should be equal wages for equal work but that is not a question which I am required to answer not being there in the schedule to the order of reference. Shri Tanti submits that the proposal of Government of India, Ministry of Labour was published in 1973 where Rs. 3.50 per day for unskilled workers was proposed. It is still a proposal and it is admitted that minimum wages for China Clay mine workers have not yet been fixed. Now let me go to the schedule of issue in the order of reference. The Tribunal derives its jurisdiction from the order of reference and cannot go beyond this. Shri Tanti does not place before me any paper to show what was the demand of the workmen for wage increase. In the order of reference there is an issue—what should be the wage structure and from what date. I may say here that Tribunal is guided by Industrial Dispute, Act, 1947 and the rules framed thereunder. According to law the Tribunal can adjudicate only that dispute which was first raised by the workmen with the management. If any particular dispute was not raised, the Tribunal has no jurisdiction to adjudicate that dispute. Shri Tanti does not prove from any paper or by any other means that before the matter went for conciliation he demanded with the management that a wage structure should be framed and it should be given effect from a particular date. In the absence of this, this Tribunal cannot adjudicate as to what should be the wage structure and from what date. From the failure of conciliation report it appears that the Deputy President Mr. Tanti raised an industrial dispute before the Assistant Labour Commissioner (C) Chaibasa for wage increase to the workers. So it is clear that Shri Tanti as Deputy President of the union raised no industrial dispute with the management for a wage structure or the date from which it should come to effect. So this Tribunal has no jurisdiction to fix any wage structure and fix a date from which it should come into effect. I may say in this connection that there is a demand for wage increase. The union on record should prove by dependable papers as to what wages the workers of other mines in the region are getting. Only word of mouth is not sufficient. The union has not produced any document to show what wages the workers of other mines in the region are getting. The Court must be helped with data which has not been done in this case. By satisfactory documents the union should show that other mines are giving more to justify demand for wage increase. It has not been done. So justification for wage increase has not been established. There is a subsisting settlement in respect of wages and in that view of the matter there cannot be any fresh case for increase of wages. In short the union on record could not properly prove their case.

In the result the demand for increase in wages by the workmen of Katipara China Clay Mines of Messrs Maharaja Cossimbazar China Clay Mines (Private) Limited, P.O. Karanjia District Singhbhum is found not justified. The Tribunal has no jurisdiction to fix a wage structure and the date for its coming into effect, as no such industrial dispute was raised with the management.

This is my award.

18th June, 1976

K. K. SARKAR, Presiding Officer.
[No. I-29011/7/75-D III(B)]

New Delhi, the 30th June, 1976

S.O. 2664—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal Jaipur, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Raipura Sand Stone Mine of Sardar Gurumukh Singh, Min.

Owner, Chhawani, Kota, District Bundi (Rajasthan) and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 23rd June, 1976.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM-LABOUR COURT, JABALPUR (M.P.)

Reference No. CGIT/LC(R)(36)/1975

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Rajpura Sand Stone Mine of Sardar Gurumukh Singh, Mine Owner, Chhawani, Kota District Bundi (Rajasthan) and their workmen represented through the President, Pathar Khan Mazdoor Sangh, Kota (Rajasthan).

APPEARANCES :

For employers—None.—

For workmen—Shri Mahabir Prasad Sharma, President of the Union.

INDUSTRY : Sand Stone DISTRICT : Bundi (Rajasthan)
AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour vide its order No. L-29011/56/75-D.O. 3(B) dated 12th June, 1975 referred the following question for adjudication by this Tribunal :—

"Whether the workmen employed in Rajpura Sand Stone Mine of Sardar Gurumukh Singh, Mine Owner, Chhawani, Kota, District Bundi (Rajasthan) are entitled for grant of paid festival or national holidays ? If so, how many and on what occasion ?"

2. Shri Mahabir Prasad Sharma, President of the Union, filed a settlement dated 17-3-1976 signed by himself for the workmen and by Shri Gurumukh Singh on behalf of the employer. A notice was sent to the employer to verify the terms of the settlement. The employer has now verified the same through an application dated 26-5-1976 sent by post.

3. The parties have settled the dispute mutually on the following terms :—

(1) It has been agreed that the workman employed in Rajpura Sand Stone Mines of Sardar Gurumukh Singh, Mine Owner, Chhawani, Kota shall be given the following paid festival and national holidays with effect from 1-1-1975 :—

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-----------|
| 1. 26th January (Republic Day) | ... 1 day |
| 2. Holi (Dulandi) | ... 1 day |
| 3. 1st May (Labour Day) | ... 1 day |
| 4. Rakshabandhan | ... 1 day |
| 5. Krishna Janmashtmi | ... 1 day |
| 6. 15th August (Independence Day) | ... 1 day |
| 7. Dushehra | ... 1 day |
| 8. Deepawali | ... 1 day |
| 9. 2nd October (Gandhi Jayanti) | ... 1 day |
| 10. Id | ... 1 day |

(2) It is further agreed that the dues arising out of this settlement shall be paid by the employer to the workers by 15th April, 1976.

4. Since the dispute has been amicably settled between the parties, I record my award in terms of the aforesaid settlement.

4th June, 1976.

[No. L-29011/56/75-D III(B)]

S. N. JOHRI, Presiding Officer.

S.O. 2665.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal Jabalpur in the industrial dispute

between the employers in relation to the management of Rajpura Sand Stone Mines of Sardar Gurumukh Singh, Mine Owner, Chhawani, Kota (Rajasthan) and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 23rd June, 1976.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM-LABOUR COURT, JABALPUR (M.P.)

Reference No. CGIT/LC(R)(38)/1975

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Rajpura Sand Stone Mines of Sardar Gurumukh Singh, Mine Owner, Chhawani, Kota (Rajasthan) and their workmen represented through the President, Pathar Khan Mazdoor Sangh, Kota (Rajasthan).

APPEARANCES :

For employers—None.—

For workmen—Shri Mahabir Prasad Sharma, President of the Union.

INDUSTRY : Sand Stone. DISTRICT : Kota (Rajasthan)
AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour vide its order No. L-29011/48/75-D.O. III(B) dated 13th June, 1975 referred the following question for adjudication by this Tribunal :—

"Whether the demand of the workmen employed in Rajpura Sand Stone Mines of Sardar Gurumukh Singh, Chhawani, Kota (Rajasthan) for payment of profit sharing bonus @20 per cent of wages for the accounting years 1970-71, 1971-72, 1972-73 and 1973-74 is justified ? If not, to what quantum of bonus are the said workmen entitled for each of the year."

2. Shri Mahabir Prasad Sharma, President of the Union, filed a settlement dated 17-3-1976 signed by himself for the workmen and by Shri Gurumukh Singh on behalf of the employer. A notice was sent to the employer to verify the terms of the settlement. The employer has now verified the same through an application dated 26-5-1976 sent by post.

3. The parties have settled the dispute mutually on the following terms :—

(i) It has been agreed that the workers of Rajpura Sand Stone Mine of M/s. Khalsa Stone Co., Owners Chhawani Kota will be paid profit sharing bonus @ 10 per cent for the accounting year 1973-74.

(ii) It is further agreed that the amount arising out of Clause (i) above shall be paid to the workers by the 15th of April, 1976.

4. Since the dispute has been amicably settled between the parties, I record my award in terms of the aforesaid settlement.

S. N. JOHRI, Presiding Officer.

[No. L-29011/48/75-D III(B)]

4th June, 1976.

New Delhi, the 6th July, 1976

S.O. 2666.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal Calcutta, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Goenka Kajora Colliery, No. 1 & 2 Pits, Unit of Shyam-sunderpur Colliery of Coal Mines Authority Limited, Post Office Ukhra District Budwan and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 24th June, 1976.

CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL
AT CALCUTTA.

REFERENCE NO. 19 OF 1975

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Goenka
Kajora 1 and 2 Pits Unit of Shyamsunderpur
Colliery of Coal Mines Authority Limited.

AND

Their Workmen.

APPEARANCE :

On behalf of Employers.

Shri N. Dass, Advocate, with
Shri B. N. Lala, Asst. Chief Personnel Officer,
Shri P. S. Lall Singh, Senior Personnel Officer, and
Shri P. N. Singh Area Industrial Relation Officer, Area VI

On behalf of Workmen.

Sri Benarsi Singh Azad, General Secretary, Khan
Shramik Congress.

STATE : West Bengal

INDUSTRY : Coal Mine.

AWARD

By Order No. L-19012/9/74-LRII, dated 28th February, 1975, the Government of India, Ministry of Labour referred an industrial dispute existing between the employers in relation to the management of Goenka Kajora 1 and 2 Pits Unit of Shyamsunderpur Colliery of Coal Mines Authority Limited and their workmen, to this Tribunal, for adjudication. The reference reads as :

"Whether the management, Coal Mines Authority Limited, in relation to Goenka Kajora 1 and 2 Pits Unit of Shyamsunderpur Colliery, P.O. Ukhra, District Burdwan are justified in stopping from the work Saryashri Kashi Nayak, Bhomi Lanka and Hanu Jana, Shale Pickers with effect from 18th February, 1974? If not to what relief are the workmen entitled?"

2. On 23-5-74 the Coal Mines Authority Limited, the employers in this case, filed a written statement alleging that Sri Kashi Nayak and Shri Bhomi Lanka intruded in the colliery during the week ending 30-6-73 and 23-6-73 respectively and that Sri Hanu Jana similarly intruded in the colliery on 10-2-1973 and worked some times in the mines of the colliery when Sri Nayak and Hanu Jana were detected on 18-2-74 and Bhomi Lanka on 16-2-1974 as workmen who were not authorised to work and as such they had been stopped from working in the mine with effect from 18-2-1974. According to the management, they had no subsisting right to work in the mine and that their entry into the mine was as a result of some fraud committed by some unschrupulous persons and as such their claim that they were workmen of the colliery could not be accepted.

3. On 16-8-75 the Khan Shramik Congress, the union which represent the workmen stated in their written statement that these three workmen were bonafide employees of Goenka Kajora 1 & 2 Pits Unit where they worked even in the year 1972 and continued to work thereafter for which they had been paid bonus under the Payment of Bonus Act for the year 1972 and similar bonus on their earned wages had also been paid from November, 1972 to November, 1973. They stated further that their wages were paid through Sri Debu Hari Jana, a Sirdar who was in charge of wagon loaders as well as Shale Pickers. The payment of wages through the Sirdar was however discontinued as a result of the intervention of the union with the management on 27-2-73 and payment of wages thereafter was continued by making payment directly to the workmen. Therefore, they raised the contention that as workmen of the Coal Mines Authority Limited they are entitled to continue in service and their stopping of work with effect from 18-2-74 was unjustified.

4. In answer to the above written statement the Coal Mines Authority Limited filed a rejoinder dated 31st January, 1976. The employers denied that the three workmen worked in the colliery in the year 1972 and that they received bonus in any manner. They alleged further that even if they had received any bonus that will not entitled them to claim to be the workmen of the colliery. They did not accept any of the allegations contained in the written statement of the workmen.

5. The three concerned workmen are said to have been employed in the erstwhile Goenka Kajora 1 & 2 Pits Unit Colliery, District Burdwan and that they worked in the mines of their colliery in 1972. In support of that contention the two workmen were examined as WW-1, Hanu Jana and WW-2 Bhomi Lanka. WW-3 is Debu Hari Jana who was admittedly the Sirdar in charge of the workmen until the payment of wages through him was stopped through the intervention of the union. Ext. M-4 dated 22-2-73 is the copy of a circular issued on behalf of the Coal Mines Authority putting an end to the practice of payment of wages through sirdars and continuance of payment of wages directly to the workmen. WW-3 proved that the concerned three workmen were under him as Shale pickers in the concerned mine in the year 1972 and they worked in the mine. The fact that these three workmen had been working at least in the year 1973 in the colliery under the Coal Mines Authority was more or less admitted. MW-1, Shivas-tava, now acting as Sub-Area Manager of a different colliery served this Goenka Kajora 1 & 2 Pits Unit colliery from 1970 to 1975. He stated in his examination chief as follows: "All these three persons worked on different dates as General mazdoor casual workers, I stopped them from duty". It is therefore relevant to consider whether the same workmen were employees of the Goenka Kajora 1 & 2 Pits Unit colliery in the year 1972. In support of that contention the Union has caused the employers to produce the bonus sheets by which bonus had been paid to these workmen. Ext. M-2 is the bonus sheet for the period from November, 1971 to October, 1972. The serial number one in that list was none other than WW-3 who himself was a loading sirdar. He had signed the bonus sheets for the purpose of identification of workmen. Sl. No. 36 in Ext. M-2 is Hanu Jana, one of the concerned workmen. He was seen to have been paid Rs 33.99p, as the annual bonus for the period Nov. 1971 to October, 1972. The payment is proved through WW-3. WW-1 Hanu Jana also stated that he had received the bonus as above. However, it is disputed that Hanu Jana described as item 36 in Ext. M-2 was somebody else as the bonus was seen paid to wagon loaders. It is true that Hanu Jana was described in Ext. M-2 as wagon loader in column 5 of the sheet. On this point the evidence on the union side is conclusive to show that the person described as item 36 in Ext. M-2 as WW-1 Hanu Jana himself. On the management's side there was no conclusive evidence to show that it was anybody else. MW-1 however stated in page 3 of his deposition as follows. "One Hanu Jana whose name appears in the Bonus sheet must be another Hanu Jana who was working as wagon loader." That evidence was only a suggestion. He had no personal knowledge of the persons concerned. He admitted in the later stage of his evidence that he had no personal knowledge of the concerned workmen. He also stated that he never met them before. It would be difficult to hold on the basis of his evidence that the person mentioned in item 36 of Ext. M-2 as a person other than the workman WW-1, Hanu Jana. It can also be said that no other independent evidence had been cited to establish that the person mentioned in item 36 of Ext. M-2 was some other Hanu Jana who worked as a wagon loader. The evidence of WWs 1, 2, and 3 proved beyond doubt that WW-1 Hanu Jana worked as an employee of Goenka Kajora 1 & 2 Pits Unit colliery in the year 1972 and that bonus was paid to him for that year. Bonus was actually paid by the Coal Mines Authority Limited on the basis of verification they made.

6. The case of the employers was that these workmen were let into the colliery at the instance of one Rudra Narain Ojha. The management however did not take any such specific contention in the written statement. But in the course of evidence it was sought to be brought out that Sri Ojha was chargesheeted for the alleged intrusion of these workmen in the colliery unauthorisedly and that his service was terminated. In support of that version they have produced Exts. M-7 and M-8. Ext. M-8 dated 4-7-74 is a direction to Sri Ojha that the charges framed against him had been proved and that his services were terminated. But immedia-

tely thereafter he was reinstated in service by an order, Ext. M-7. He was said to have been reinstated in service on sympathetic grounds. There was nothing on record to show that the charge against him was that he inducted the workmen to the colliery without the knowledge of the management and his service was terminated on that account. The Union had given notice to the management to produce the enquiry proceeding in respect of dismissal of Rudra Narain Ojha. But no reply had filed to that petition much less any evidence produced to show why the document called for was not produced. In the absence of the enquiry proceedings there is no ground to hold that the workmen were inducted at the colliery unauthorisedly at the instance of Sri Ojha and much less at the instance of WW-3. WW-3 had given evidence that the three workmen were regular employees of the Goenka Kajora 1 & 2 Pits Unit colliery in 1972 and they continued to work in the colliery even after it was taken over by the Central Government with effect from 1-5-1973.

7. There is also evidence that Bhomi Lanka and Kashi Nayak, the two workmen had also been paid bonus for the year 1972 as the workmen of Goenka Kajora 1 & 2 Pits Unit. They were paid each Rs. 80/-. Ext. M-3 is the bonus payment sheet. Items 85 and 86 in Ext. M-3 are the two concerned workmen. They affixed their thumb impressions against the receipt of money on the basis of Ext. M-3 bonus sheet. It was also counter-signed by WW-3 for the purpose of identification of the workmen. In addition to the payment of bonus under Ext. M-2 and M-3 there was further evidence to show that the concerned three workmen had continued their work in the colliery after it was taken over by the Coal Mines Authority Limited. In this connection entries in Exts M-5, M-5(a) and M-5(b) may be seen. These entries are made in the name of these workmen in the register which was kept for payment of bonus under Rule 11(3A) of Bonus Scheme. The payment was to be made quarterly in proportion to the wages the workmen earned. In the third quarter of 1973 Hanu Jana was paid Rs. 24.50 P for working 49 days from 14.7.73 to 30.9.73. He had also worked two days, on 10.2.73 and the other on 19.3.73. Similarly he worked for 70 days in the fourth quarter of 1973, from 6-10-73 to 29-12-73 for which he had been paid Rs. 34/-. Similarly Sri Bhomi Lanka worked from 14.7.73 to 30.9.73 for 66 days getting bonus of Rs. 30 in the third quarter of 1973, during the fourth quarter he worked for 64 days from 6-10-73 to 29-12-73 getting Rs. 35.50 P. as bonus. Sri Kashi Nayak worked for 59 days in the third quarter getting Rs. 29.50 P. bonus. He worked from 14-7-1973 to 30-9-1973. During the fourth quarter of 1973 he got Rs. 35.55 P for working 64 days in that quarter. The entries are respectively in Exts. M-5(a) and M-5(b) of the Bonus Register. The payment was said to have been made to the workmen as defined in Section 2(3) of the Payment of Bonus Act, 1965. Evidently, any person working for 30 days in a concerned year would be entitled to get bonus under Section 8 of that Act. The workmen concerned had complied with these provisions to earn the bonus under the Act as well as the Bonus under the Scheme.

8. The contention of the employer was that the payments were made as ex-gratia payment without any validity attached to it. They had relied upon Ext. M-6 dated 24-9-73, for the purpose of showing that wherever no records were available for proving attendance an ex-gratia payment of bonus was ordered to be made and that in the case of payment of Profit Sharing bonus average attendance for the months of February, March and April of the year shall be taken into consideration. So, it was alleged that payment had been made to these workmen as there were no regular records for attendance. It is not correct to say that there were no regular record for attendance. It is admitted that as a matter of fact these workmen were employed and they had been working in the colliery under the Coal Mines Authority Limited at least from June, 1973, as will be seen from the bonus records. It was also seen that they had worked in the year 1972 in the mine which belonged to Goenka Kajora 1 & 2 Pits Unit colliery.

9. As soon as the workmen were stopped from work the union had sent a complaint to the Manager concerned on 12-3-74, a copy of which is marked as Ext. W-1. It was sent under certificate of posting Ext. W-2 was the postal receipt. There was a conciliation in respect of that complaint. Conciliation was taken up by the Assistant Labour Commissioner, Reniganj. Ext. W-3 was the copy of his failure report. The Assistant Labour Commissioner himself was examined as WW-4. He had also produced the entire file

connected with the same proceeding. It is marked as Ext. C-1. WW-4 had occasion to meet both the parties and discuss the dispute with regard to the stoppage of work. He had occasion to verify the records in the case and he sent the failure report on the basis of the conclusion which he arrived at. There is no justification to throw any blame on this officer. He had done his duty and attempted conciliation of the industrial dispute. Though his conclusion is not binding on this tribunal, it could be said that the management did not raise any of the objections which they have now raised before this tribunal for consideration by WW-4, the Assistant Labour Commissioner. Added to this there is the evidence of WW-5, the Organising Secretary of Khan Shramik Congress. He had stated that at the time when the three workmen were stopped from work they were not members of the Union. That appears to be the reason why the names of these workmen were not included in Ext. M-1 complaint which Sri Azad as the General Secretary of the Union sent to shale pickers. He had enumerated as many as 118 names ground for Sri Azad to include the names of these three workmen in Ext. M-1, as that complaint was made in respect of wagon loaders who were unemployed and not with regard to shale pickers. He had enumerated as many as 118 names in the list. They were all described as wagon loaders. So, there was no occasion for him to include the names of these shale pickers who are the workmen in the concerned reference in Ext. M-1. The fact that they were not members of the union were also another circumstance for non-inclusion of the names in Ext. M-1. But the union had sent the names of these three workmen in their first complaint which they sent to the colliery as on 12-3-74 which is marked as Ext. W-1. There was therefore no laches on the part of the union in not making timely mention of the names of these workmen in Ext. M-1 list.

10. The fact that these workmen were employees of Goenka Kajora 1 & 2 Pits colliery in 1972 and that they continued to work under the Coal Mines Authority in the mine has to be admitted; that they were inducted to the mine unauthorisedly has not been established. The mere assertion that they were unauthorised persons would not be sufficient. There must be some material evidence by way of corroboration that they were inducted to the Coal Mines unauthorisedly at the instance of Rudra Narain Ojha or at the instance of WW-3 Debu Hari Jana. WW-3 had denied that he had anything to do with the induction of the workmen unauthorisedly in the coal mine. On the other hand, he stated that the workmen had been working under him; that he distributed their wages and that they continued to work under the Coal Mines Authority in the same coal mine where they had been working before. It is also not proved as to how the management came to know that these workmen were intruders in the mine. MW-1 stated that he thought they might have been admitted to the coal mine unauthorisedly and therefore he stopped their work. Any way, in the course of his cross-examination he also stated that he came to know from the records of the Provident Fund maintained in his office that the names of these persons were not included as recipients of Provident fund. So, the evidence is that the management had the Provident Fund account with them. On this aspect of the question in the written statement of the union a specific assertion was made that the three workmen were members of the Coal Mines Provident fund. But the management stated that that assertion was irrelevant for the purpose of determining the issue involved in the reference. However, in paragraph 7 of their rejoinder they also denied what was stated in paragraph 7 of the written statement of the union. Except their mere denial there is nothing to show that these workmen were not recipient of the Provident fund money. It is for the management to have produced the records relating to the P.F. account in respect of the workmen of the colliery. No attempt had been made to produce them. MW-1 has stated something about Provident fund in his examination but he did not say that the names of these persons did not find place in the P.F. account. In view of the nature of the contention raised by the employer it is not possible to hold that the workmen concerned were not recipients of the Provident Fund benefit. Any way, that question does not arise directly in this reference. It is mentioned only for the purpose of showing that MW-1 had absolutely no knowledge as to whether these workmen were inducted to the mine in 1972 unauthorisedly or they continued to work in the coal mine in the same capacity until they were turned out of employment. MW-1 did not meet these workmen at any time. He did not know these workmen. How could it be said that these workmen did not work or that they were not employed by the Goenka Kajora 1 & 2 Pits Unit colliery in 1972 or that they did not continue to work under the Coal Mines

Authority? The evidence before the Tribunal is that there three workmen were bonafide employees of Goenka Kajora 1 & 2 Pits Unit colliery and that they continued in that capacity until they were stopped from work with effect from 18th February, 1974. There is no reason to reject that evidence. I have gone through the evidence on behalf of the union and I am satisfied that their evidence is reliable, straight forward and convincing. There is no reasonable ground to reject the evidence. The evidence on behalf of the Union has therefore to be accepted. I hold that the three persons were the workmen of Coal Mines Authority Limited and as such stopping them from work with effect from 18-2-1974 was not justified.

11. There was evidence that these workmen were unemployed after they were turned out from the coal mine. There was no evidence contra. There is no reason to disallow the back wages due to these workmen. However, they would be entitled to get the back wages from the date of this Reference i.e. 28th February, 1975.

12. In the result, the reference is answered in favour of the workmen. The workmen Surva Shri Kashi Nayak, Bhomi Lanka and Hanu Jana will be reinstated to the post which they held on 17th Feb., 1974 with continuity in service as the stopping of their work as found unjustified. They would be paid their back wages with effect from 28th February, 1975.

E. K. MOIDU, Presiding Officer

[No. 49012/9/74-LRII]

Dated, Calcutta,

the 17th June, 1976

S.O. 2667.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Jabalpur, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Pipakheri Stone Mines of Shri Ramjidas Ramrichpal, mine owner, Post Office Morak Station District Kota and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 25th June, 1976.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM-LABOUR COURT, JABALPUR (M.P.)

Case No. CGIT/LC(R) (8) of 1976

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Pipakheri Stone Mine of Shri Ramjidas Ramrichpal, Mine Owner, Post Office Morak Station, District Kota and their workmen through the Office Secretary, Rashtriya Mazdoor Sangh, Ramgunjmandi (Rajasthan)

APPEARANCES :

For employers—None.
For Workmen—None.

INDUSTRY : Stone Mine

DISTRICT : Kota (Rajasthan).

AWARD

The Government of India in the Labour Department has referred the following question for adjudication by this Tribunal vide its Order No. I-29011/10A/D/III(B) dated 15th May, 1976 :—

"Whether the demand of the workmen of Pipakheri Stone Mines of Messrs Ramjidas Ramrichpal, Mines Owner, Morak Station (District Kota) for grant of Bonus at the rate of 20 per cent of the Wages for the Accounting Year 1974-75 is justified? If not, to what quantum of bonus are the said workmen entitled to?"

On 14th June, 1976 the Union President, Shri Swadhin Kumar Sharma and the Treasurer-cum-office Secretary, Shri Ram Gopal Gupta, entered into a settlement with Ramjidas Ramrichpal, Owner of the said Mine. They have prayed that the award be given in terms of the settlement so arrived at between the parties. No objection against that settlement has been filed. The award is, therefore, given as follows :—

For the Accounting Year 1974-75 the Bonus shall be paid at the rate of 8 per cent. The same shall be paid by 30th June, 1976 in presence of the representative of the Union according to the terms of Bonus Act, 1965 and the Rules framed thereunder. Within 15 days of the payment i.e. by 15th July, 1976 both the parties will submit the report to the Labour Commissioner, Kota.

S. N. JOHRI, Presiding Officer
[No. L-29011/10A/76-D-III(B)]

S.O. 2668.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal Jabalpur, in the Industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the Ambala Sand Stone Mines of Shri Kailash Chand Yadav, Mine Owner, Post Office Taraj District Jhalawar and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 25th June, 1976.

[No. L-29011/12/76-DIII(B)]

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM-LABOUR COURT, JABALPUR (M.P.)

Case No. CGIT/LC(R) (6) of 1976

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Ambala Sand Stone Mine of Shri Kailash Chand Yadav, Mine Owner, Post Office Taraj, District Jhalawar and their workmen through the President, Pathar Khan Mazdoor Sangh, Kota (Rajasthan)

APPEARANCES :

For employers—None.
For workmen—None.

INDUSTRY : Sand Stone Mine DISTRICT : Jhalawar
(Rajasthan)

AWARD

This is a reference made by the Government of India in the Labour Department vide its order No. L-29011/12/76 D III(B) dated 14th May, 1976 projecting the following question for adjudication by this Tribunal :—

"Whether the demand of the workmen employed in Ambala Sand Stone Mine, Post Office Taraj, District Jhalawar, of Shri Kailash Chand Yadav, Mine Owner, for grant of ten paid national and festival holidays is justified? If so, on what occasions and from which year?"

2. Notices were issued to both the parties to file their respective written statements but union has not cared to file the same inspite of proper service while the employer has refused to accept the registered letter containing the notice hence it has returned unserved. Both the parties are absent and not represented. Under the circumstance it is difficult to launch an enquiry and adjudicate the dispute referred by the Government of India to this tribunal.

3. It was observed by the division bench of Delhi High Court in Mata Fabricators (India) Vs. B. D. Gupta 1976 (32) P.L.R. 118 D.B. at page 123 that :

"A party can be heard only if it appears. If it does not willfully appear, the presumption would be that it does not desire to be heard or that it has nothing to say".

The very fact that relying on the obiter Dictum of Supreme Court the High Court of Delhi in the aforesaid case held that Tribunal should follow the general pattern of Civil procedure Code and conceded the right to the Tribunal to restore a case dismissed for default of appearance or to set aside an ex-parte award if sufficient cause is shown, leads to the inference that the Tribunal has the jurisdiction to decide the reference ex-parte or on the burden of proof if one side or both the sides, as the case may be, refuse to

take interest in the case and fail to come forward to assist it in the discharge of its quasi judicial functions. Adjudication of the award done in this manner would not render it as non est or nullity unless it is suitably set aside or superceded by a second reference on the same point.

4. In *Sital Vs. C.O.I.T. Jabalpur* (1969 II L J 1 275) Division Bench of Madhya Pradesh High Court did make an obiter dicta in passing at the end of page 278 that a reference cannot be dismissed for default because that would amount to putting an end to the proceedings otherwise than by adjudication. The point before the Court in that case was about the validity of an award based on settlement which did not disclose the manner in which the dispute was settled. It was while examining an Andhra Pradesh case that the High Court made that remark in passing against dismissal for default. Such an obiter has no force of a binding precedent.

5. There are various cases of Allahabad, Mysore, and Andhra High Courts in which the question of validity of ex-parte awards was considered in the light of the word 'determination' used in S. 2(b), and the word 'adjudication' used in 8, 10 of Industrial Disputes Act, but those are cases where such consideration was necessitated for deciding the validity of second reference on the same dispute. However in none of those cases the High Courts had occasion to consider the character and status of such an award till another reference is made or till it is set aside. Those cases thus do not lay down an absolute bar against the Tribunal proceeding ex-parte in case the party deliberately omits to appear and assist the Tribunal in the discharge of its quasi judicial functions.

6. Rule 22 of Industrial Dispute Rules (Central) permits a Tribunal to proceed with the adjudication of a reference assuming as if the party, which omits to appear in pursuance of the notice, was actually present before it. Thus if both the parties deliberately fail to appear in obedience to the notice it would be presumed that they are present yet they do not want to take part in the proceedings or assist the Tribunal by producing evidence in support of their respective stands or, as observed by the Delhi High Court (*Supra*), that they do not desire to be heard or that they have nothing to say. This Rule thus authorises the Tribunal to decide on the evidence available on the record or on the burden of proof.

7. It has been held in *Ramendra Vs. 8th Industrial Tribunal Calcutta 1975 1 Lab.Lc. 94 (Cal)* that :

"The principle of law enunciated on the burden of proof and onus of proof being a basic principle of law the Industrial Tribunals are also required to follow it."

Thus in the present case where both the parties have refused to appear and assist the Tribunal, it has no alternative but to adjudicate upon the dispute having recourse to the principle of burden of proof.

8. The question as posed by the Government throws the burden of proving the justification on the Union concerned which has raised the demand. The Union has failed to file any written statement justifying the demand in spite of service of the notice. Nobody has appeared on behalf of the Union and it appears that the Union is not interested in proving its case. The reference is, therefore, answered in negative and the award is given accordingly.

18-6-1976.

S. N. JOHRI, Presiding Officer

[No. I-29011/12/76-DIII(B)]

F. SEQUEIRA, Desk Officer

नई दिल्ली, 30 जून, 1976

क्र० प्र० 2669—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स ग्रामो साइकिल स्टोर्स, 21-ए, ब्रार० जी० कर रोड, कलकत्ता-4 नामक स्थापन से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और कृटुम्ब पेंशन निधि अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए,

अतः, अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

यह अधिसूचना 1972 के अग्रस्त, के तेरहवें दिन को प्रवृत्त समझी जाएगी।

[स० एस-35017 (29)/73-पी० एफ०-2]

New Delhi, the 30th June, 1976

S.O. 2669.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Gramo Cycle Stones, 21-A, R. G. Kar Road, Calcutta-4 have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Family Pension Fund Act, 1952 (19 of 1952) should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said act the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the thirteenth day of April, 1972.

[No. S-35017(29)/73-PF. II]

क्र० प्र० 2670.—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स श्री बालकन्दविलास बीबिंग फैक्टरी, कोयम्बतूर, रोड, कारूर नामक स्थापन से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और कृटुम्ब पेंशन निधि अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए,

अतः, अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

यह अधिसूचना 1 अगस्त, 1975 को प्रवृत्त हुई समझी जाएगी।

[स० एस-35019(12)/76-पी० एफ०-2]

S.O. 2670.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs See Balakanda Vilas Weaving Factory, Coimbatore Road, Karur, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Fund and Family Pension Act, 1952 (19 of 1952) should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the 1st day of August, 1975.

[No. S-35019(12)/76-PF. II]

क्र० प्र० 2671.—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स सिमथ्स इंडिया वर्क्स, मुन्नोटो मुखर्जी रोड, जसाहली थैस्ट बंगलौर-15 नामक स्थापन से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और कृटुम्ब पेंशन निधि अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए।

अतः, अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

यह अधिसूचना 31 जनवरी, 1976 को प्रवृत्त हुई समझी जाएगी।

[स० एस-35019(14)/76-पी० एफ०-2(i)]

New Delhi, the 30th June, 1976

S.O. 2671.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Smiths India Works, Subroto Mukherji Road, Jalahalli West, Bangalore-15, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Family Pension Fund Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment.

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the thirty first day of January, 1976.

[No. S. 35019/14/76-PF-II(i)]

का० प्रा० 2672.—केन्द्रीय सरकार कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और कुटुम्ब पेंशन निधि, अधिनियम 1952 (1952 का 19) की धारा 6 के प्रथम परन्तुक द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, संबद्ध विषय में आवश्यक जाँच करने के पश्चात् 31 जनवरी, 1976 से मेसर्स स्मिथ्स इंडिया वर्क्स, सुब्रोतो मुखर्जी रोड, जलाहली वेस्ट, बंगलूर-15 नामक स्थापन को उक्त परन्तुक के प्रयोजनों के लिए विनिर्दिष्ट करती है।

[सं० एम० 35019/14/76-पी० एफ०-II(ii)]

S.O. 2672.—In exercise of the powers conferred by the first proviso to section 6 of the Employees' Provident Funds and Family Pension Fund Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), the Central Government, after making necessary enquiry into the matter, hereby specifies with effect from the thirty first day of January, 1976, the establishment known as Messrs Smiths India Works, Subroto Mukherji Road, Jalahalli West, Bangalore-15 for the purposes of the said proviso.

[No. S. 35019/14/76-PF-II(ii)]

का० प्रा० 2673.—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मेसर्स गीथा टेक्स्टाइल्स, बीविंग एण्ड डाइंग फैक्टरी, पुगलूर रोड, करूर 1, नामक स्थापना से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और कुटुम्ब पेंशन निधि अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए।

अतः, अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

यह अधिसूचना अगस्त, 1975 के प्रथम दिन को प्रवृत्त हुई समझी जाएगी।

[सं० एम० 35019/25/76-पी० एफ० II]

S.O. 2673.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Geetha Textiles, Weaving and Dyeing Factory, Pugalur Road, Karur-1, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Family Pension Fund Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment.

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the first day of August, 1975.

[No. S. 35019/25/76-PF. II]

का० प्रा० 2674.—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मेसर्स पापीनोसेरी वीवर्स इन्डस्ट्रियल (वर्कशॉप) को-ऑपरेटिव सोसाइटी लिमिटेड, सं० एच० एल० आई० एन० डी (ग) 15, पापीनोसेरी, कन्नानोर जिला, नामक स्थापना से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और कुटुम्ब पेंशन निधि अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए।

अतः, अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

यह अधिसूचना जनवरी, 1976 के प्रथम दिन को प्रवृत्त हुई समझी जाएगी।

[सं० एम० 35019/27/76-पी० एफ० II]

S.O. 2674.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as the Pappinisseri Weavers Industrial (Workshop) Co-operative Society Limited, No. HL-IND(C) 15, Pappinisseri, Cannanore District, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Family Pension Fund Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment.

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the first day of January, 1976.

[No. S. 35019/27/76-PF-II]

का० प्रा० 2675.—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मेसर्स अकोला डिस्ट्रिक्ट बेकर्स को-ऑपरेटिव सोसाइटी लि०, अकोला नामक स्थापना से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और कुटुम्ब पेंशन निधि अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए।

अतः, अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

यह अधिसूचना 1974 की जुलाई के प्रथम दिन को प्रवृत्त हुई समझी जाएगी।

[सं० एम० 35019/36/75-पी० एफ०-II]

S.O. 2675.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Akola District Bakers Co-operative Society Limited, Akola, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Family Pension Fund Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment.

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the first day of July, 1974.

[No. S. 35018/36/75-PF-II]

का० प्रा० 2676.—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मेसर्स रेत को टेक्स्टाइल्स, राम निवास कम्पाउण्ड, बीजलपुर, नवसारी नामक स्थापना से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और कुटुम्ब पेंशन निधि

अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए;

अतः, अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

यह अधिसूचना 1975 के मार्च के इकतीसवें दिन को प्रवृत्त हुई समझी जाएगी।

[संख्या एस-35019(55)/75-पी-एफ-2]

S.O. 2676.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Rainbow Textiles, Ramnivas Compound, Vijalpore, Navasari, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Family Pension Fund Act, 1952 (19 of 1952) should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the thirty-first day of March, 1975.

[S. 35019(55)/75-PF-II]

का० प्रा० 2677.—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स बीजलपुर यार्न वर्क्स, पोस्ट बॉक्स नं० 37, राम निवास कम्पाउण्ड, बीजलपुर, नवगारी नामक स्थापन से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और कुटुम्ब पेंशन निधि अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए;

अतः, अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

यह अधिसूचना 31 मार्च, 1975 को प्रवृत्त हुई समझी जाएगी।

[सं० एस-35019(75)/75-पी० एफ०-2]

S.O. 2677.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Vijalpore Yarn Works, Post Box No. 37, Ramnivas Compound, Vijalpore, Navasari, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Family Pension Fund Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the thirty first day of March, 1975.

[No. S. 35019(75)/75-PF-II]

का० प्रा० 2678.—कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) की धारा 6 के प्रथम परन्तुक द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार इस विषय में आवश्यक जाँच कर लेने के पश्चात् मैसर्स ए एण्ड ए प्रिंटर्स (प्राइवेट) लिमिटेड, कांजीकुडी, कोट्टायम्-4 (केरला) नामक स्थापन को 1 सितम्बर, 1975 से उक्त परन्तुक के प्रयोजनों के लिए विनिर्दिष्ट करती है।

[सं० एस-35019(215)/75-पी० एफ० 2(ii)]

एस० एस० सहस्रानामन, उप सचिव

S.O. 2678.—In exercise of the powers conferred by the first proviso to section 6 of the Employees Provident Funds and Family Pension Fund Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), the Central Government, after making necessary enquiry into the matter, hereby specifies with effect from the first day of September, 1975, the establishment known as Messrs A & A Printers (Private) Limited, Kanjikuzhy, Kettayam-4 (Kerala), for the purposes of the said proviso.

[No. S. 35019(215)/75-PF. II(ii)]

S. S. SAHASRANAMAN, Dy. Secy.

New Delhi, the 6th July, 1976

S.O. 2679.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal (No. 2), Dhanbad in the matter of applications filed by Shri Ravindra Singh and eight others C/o Jaduguda Labour Union, Post Office Jaduguda Mines under Section 33A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, which was received by the Central Government on the 29th June, 1976.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (NO. 2) AT DHANBAD

In the matter of complaint under Section 33A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947

(Arising out of Reference No. 60 of 1971 referred to by the Ministry by its Order No. L-29011/44/71-LR-IV dated 10-11-1971)

Complaint No. 3 of 1972

PARTIES :

Shri Ravindra Singh & 8 others, C/o. Jaduguda Labour Union, P. O. Jaduguda Mines, Distt. Singhbhum. Bihar. Complainants

Vs.

M/s. Uranium Corporation of India Ltd., P. O. Jaduguda Mines, Distt. Singhbhum (Bihar).

Opp. Party.

APPEARANCES :

On behalf of the complainants.—Shri M. S. Murmu, Genl. Secretary, Jaduguda Labour Union, P. O. Jaduguda Mines, Distt. Singhbhum.

On behalf of the Opp. Party.—Shri D. C. Chopra, Manager (P & A) Uranium Corporation of India Limited, P. O. Jaduguda Mines, Distt. Singhbhum (Bihar).

STATE : Bihar.

INDUSTRY : Uranium.

Dhanbad, the 19th June, 1976

AWARD

These are nine Complaints Under Section 33A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 filed by Shri Ravindra Singh and eight others against the O. P. management M/s. Uranium Corporation of India Ltd., P.O. Jaduguda Mines, Distt. Singhbhum, Bihar for necessary relief.

From the beginning the parties fought tooth and nail and considerable time was lost in this contest. At long last the parties thought it wise not to fight any more. It may be mentioned in this connection that at an early stage of the proceedings the applicant Shri B. D. Thapaliyal filed an application dated 27-3-1972 stating that he may be permitted to withdraw the complaint and the application was verified by Shri P. K. Bose, learned Advocate who appeared for the workmen. My predecessor-in-Office reserved the order in the withdrawal application. Nothing stands in the way of the complaint of Shri B. D. Thapaliyal being withdrawn and his complaint is dismissed as withdrawn. The case proceeded along its course and on 9-2-76 memorandum of settlement were filed in respect of the complaints of S/Shri P. N. Singh, P. K. Sanmukhan, Jairam Hoe, A.S.R.S. Gourpati and K.S.N. Rao. On 19-2-1976 a memorandum of settlement was filed in respect of the complaint of Ravindra Singh. A memorandum of settlement dated 4th May, 1976 in respect of the complaint of Shri P. S. Rao was received under

registered post. A memorandum of settlement dated 24-2-1976 in respect of the complaint of Suraji Sharma was also received by registered post. All the eight memorandum of settlement were signed by Shri D. C. Chopra Manager (P & A) for the management and by Shri M. S. Murmu General Secretary of the Union. The eight memorandum of settlement were also signed by the respective workmen S/Shri P. N. Singh, P. K. Sanmukhan, Jairam Hoe, A.S.R.S. Gouripati and K.S.N. Rao and Ravindra Singh verified the contents of their memorandum of settlement as correct on the side of management, Sri D. C. Chopra, Manager (P & A) also verified the contents of the above memo of settlements as correct. I have examined all the memorandum of settlement s filed before me and find that the same are beneficial to the parties. The long standing disputes have thus come to an happy end. I accept all the eight memorandum of settlements.

In the result, the complaints filed by Ravindra Singh Suraji Sharma, T. K. Sanmukhan, P. S. Rao A.S.R.S. Gouripati K.S.N. Rao, P. N. Singh and Rairam Hoe under Section 33A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 are disposed of in terms of the respective memorandum of settlements, which do form part of the order, as prayed for by the parties. The complaint as filed by Shri B. D. Thapaliwal is dismissed as withdrawn.

This is my Award.

K. K. SARKAR, Presiding Officer.

[No. 43014(1)/76-(i)-D-IV(B)]

BEFORE THE PRESIDING OFFICER,

CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL

(No. 2), DHANBAD

AT

CALCUTTA

Complaint No. 3 of 1972

(Under Section 33-A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947).

PARTIES :

Shri Ravindra Singh & 8 Others, C/o. Jaduguda Labour Union, PO : Jaduguda Mines, Distt. Singhbhum, Bihar.

—Complainant.

Vs.

M/s. Uranium Corporation of India Ltd., PO : Jaduguda Mines, Distt. Singhbhum Bihar—Opposite Party.

The Petition of Shri Ravindra Singh. The humble petitioner is one of the complainants in the above cited Complaint under section 33-A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 arising out of his dismissal from the Opposite Party's service with effect from 16-12-1971.

2. In respect of the same cause of action, viz. the petitioner's dismissal from service, for abundant caution the Opposite Party Management has also made an application in this Tribunal under Section 33(2)(b) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, for the approval of the Tribunal of its said action.

3. The said Application of the Opposite Party Management has been registered by the Tribunal as Application No. 6 of 1971.

4. The dispute involved in both the aforesaid matters, now pending in this Tribunal, has been amicably settled by mutual negotiations between the Opposite Party Management and the Complainant represented by Jaduguda Labour Union.

5. In terms of the said settlement, the Opposite Party Management had agreed to recall or withdraw its order of petitioners dismissal and to take back the petitioner in the employment of the Uranium Corporation of India Limited and to treat the period of absence as Extra-ordinary leave (non-medical).

6. The said settlement has been jointly filed by the management and petitioner in the said Application No. 6 of 1971. The said settlement may be considered as part of this record as well.

7. By virtue of the said settlement the management had prayed to the Tribunal to dispose of application in terms specified therein.

8. The petitioner who is the Opposite Party in the said Application and the said Union had agreed to the disposal of management's Application in terms of the said settlement.

9. In the circumstances, the Petitioner declares that he has no further cause of action against the management arising out of his dismissal from service except the rights conferred on him in the settlement itself.

10. The Petitioner, therefore, prays that the Tribunal may be pleased to dispose of his Complaint against the management as withdrawn.

11. Management submits that it has no objection to the Complaint being disposed of as prayed by the Petitioner.

12. The parties shall bear their respective cost of proceedings in this Complaint.

FOR THE OPPOSITE PARTY FOR THE PETITIONER
MANAGEMENT COMPLAINANT

D. C. CHOPRA,
Manager (Personnel & Administration)
Uranium Corporation of India Limited
Submitted on 19th February, 1976 at
Jaduguda.

M. S. MURMU, General Secy.
JADUGUDA LABOUR UNION

BEFORE THE PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, (No. 2),
DHANBAD

AT

CALCUTTA

Complaint No. 3 of 1972

(Under Section 33-A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947).

PARTIES :

Shri Ravindra Singh & 8 Others, C/o. Jaduguda Labour Union, P.O. : Jaduguda Mines. Distt. Singhbhum Bihar.

—Complainant.

Vs.

M/s. Uranium Corporation of India Ltd., PO : Jaduguda Mines, Distt. Singhbhum Mines, Bihar

—Opposite Party

The Petition of Shri A. S. R. S. Gourapati. The humble petitioner is one of the complainants in the above cited complaint under section 33-A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 arising out of his dismissal from the Opposite Party's service with effect from 27-12-1971.

2. In respect of the same cause of action, viz. the petitioner's dismissal from service, for abundant caution the Opposite Party Management has also made an application in this Tribunal under Section 33(2)(b) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, for the approval of the Tribunal of its said action.

3. The said Application of the Opposite Party management has been registered by the Tribunal as Application No. 12 of 1971.

4. The dispute involved in both the aforesaid matters, now pending in this Tribunal, has been amicably settled by mutual negotiations between the Opposite Party Management and the Complainant represented by Jaduguda Labour Union.

5. In terms of the said settlement, the Opposite Party Management had agreed to recall or withdraw its order of petitioners dismissal and to take back the petitioner in the employment of the Uranium Corporation of India Limited and to treat the period of absence as Extra-ordinary leave (non-medical).

6. The said settlement has been jointly filed by the management and petitioner in the said Application No. 12 of 1971. The said settlement may be considered as part of this record as well.

7. By virtue of the said settlement the management had prayed to the Tribunal to dispose of application in terms specified therein.

8. The petitioner who is the Opposite Party in the said Application and the said Union had agreed to the disposal of management's Application in terms of the said settlement.

9. In the circumstances, the Petitioner declares that he has no further cause of action against the management arising out of his dismissal from service except the rights conferred on him in the settlement itself.

10. The Petitioner, therefore, prays that the Tribunal may be pleased to dispose of his Complaint against the management as withdrawn.

11. Management submits that it has no objection to the Complaint being disposed of as prayed by the Petitioner.

12. The parties shall bear their respective cost of proceedings in this Complaint.

FOR THE OPPOSITE
PARTY MANAGEMENT

D. NARISINGH
Advocate.

FOR THE PETI-
TIONER COMPLAINT

M. S. MURMU,
General Secy.
JADUGUDA LABOUR
UNION

A. S. R. S. Gowripati,
Petitioner-Complainant

D. C. CHOPRA,
Manager (Personal &
Administration)
Uranium Corporation of
India Limited

Submitted on 9th
February, 1976 at Calcutta

BEFORE THE PRESIDING OFFICER,
CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL
(No. 2), DHANBAD
AT

CALCUTTA

COMPLAINT NO. 3 OF 1972

(Under Section 33-A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947).

PARTIES :

Shri Ravindra Singh & 8 Others, C/o. Jaduguda Labour
Union, P.O. : Jaduguda Mines, Dt. Singhbhum
Bihar. —Complainant.

VS

M/s. Uranium Corporation of India Ltd., PO : Jaduguda
Mines, Dt. Singhbhum Mines, Bihar—Opposite Party.

The Petition of Shri T. K. Shanmukham.

The humble petitioner is one of the complainants in the above cited Complaint under section 33-A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 arising out of his dismissal from the Opposite Party's service with effect from 17-12-1971.

2. In respect of the same cause of action, viz. the petitioner's dismissal from service, for abundant caution the Opposite Party—Management has also made an application in this Tribunal under Section 33(2)(b) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, for the approval of the Tribunal of its said action.

3. The said Application of the Opposite Party management has been registered by the Tribunal as Application No. 10 of 1971.

4. The dispute involved in both the aforesaid matters, now pending in this Tribunal, has been amicably settled by mutual negotiations between the Opposite Party Management and the Complainant represented by Jaduguda Labour Union.

5. In terms of the said settlement, the Opposite Party Management had agreed to recall or withdraw its order of petitioners dismissal and to take back the petitioner in the employment of the Uranium Corporation of India Limited and to treat the period of absence as Extra-ordinary leave (non-medical).

6. The said settlement has been jointly filed by the management and petitioner in the said Application No 10 of 1971. The said settlement may be considered as part of this record as well.

7. By virtue of the said settlement the management had prayed to the Tribunal to dispose of application in terms specified therein.

8. The petitioner who is the Opposite Party in the said Application and the said Union had agreed to the disposal of management's Application in terms of the said settlement.

9. In the circumstances, the Petitioner declares that he has no further cause of action against the management arising out of his dismissal from service except the rights conferred on him in the settlement itself.

10. The Petitioner, therefore, prays that the Tribunal may be pleased to dispose of his Complaint against the management as withdrawn.

11. Management submits that it has no objection to the Complaint being disposed of as prayed by the Petitioner.

12. The parties shall bear their respective cost of proceedings in this Complaint.

FOR THE OPPOSITE PARTY MANAGEMENT

D. NARSINGH, Advocate

FOR THE PETITIONER COMPLAINT

M. S. MURMU, General Secy.
JADUGUDA LABOUR UNION

D. C. CHOPRA,
Manager (Personnel &
Administration)

Uranium Corporation of
India Limited

Submitted on 9th Feb-
ruary, 1976

T. K. SHANMUKHAM,
Petitioner-Complainant.

BEFORE THE PRESIDING OFFICER,
CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL
(No. 2), DHANBAD

AT

CALCUTTA

COMPLAINT NO. 3 OF 1972

(Under Section 33-A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947).

PARTIES :

Shri Ravindra Singh & 8 Others, C/o. Jaduguda Labour
Union, PO : Jaduguda Mines Dt. Singhbhum, Bihar
—Complainant.

VS

M/s. Uranium Corporation of India Ltd., PO : Jaduguda
Mines, Dt. Singhbhum Mines, Bihar —Opposite Party

The Petition of Shri P. N. Singh

The humble petitioner is one of the complainants in the above cited Complaint under section 33-A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 arising out of his dismissal from the Opposite Party's service with effect from 16-12-1971.

2. In respect of the same cause of action, viz. the petitioner's dismissal from service, for abundant caution the Opposite Party—Management has also made an application in this Tribunal under Section 33(2)(b) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, for the approval of the Tribunal of its said action.

3. The said Application of the Opposite Party management has been registered by the Tribunal as Application No. 5 of 1971.

4. The dispute involved in both the aforesaid matters, now pending in this Tribunal, has been amicably settled by mutual negotiations between the Opposite Party Management and the Complainant represented by Jaduguda Labour Union.

5. In terms of the said settlement, the Opposite Party Management had agreed to recall or withdraw its order of petitioners dismissal and to take back the petitioner in the employment of the Uranium Corporation of India Limited and to treat the period of absence as Extra-ordinary leave (non-medical).

6. The said settlement has been jointly filed by the management and petitioner in the said Application No. 5 of 1971. The said settlement may be considered as part of this record as well.

7. By virtue of the said settlement the management had prayed to the Tribunal to dispose of application in terms specified therein.

8. The petitioner who is the Opposite Party in the said Application and the Union had agreed to the disposal of management's Application in terms of the said settlement.

9. In the circumstances, the Petitioner declares that he has no further cause of action against the management arising out of his dismissal from service except the rights conferred on him in the settlement itself.

10. The Petitioner, therefore, prays that the Tribunal may be pleased to dispose of his Complaint against the management as withdrawn.

11. Management submits that it has no objection to the Complaint being disposed of as prayed by the Petitioner.

12. The parties shall bear their respective cost of proceedings in this Complaint.

FOR THE OPPOSITE PARTY MANAGEMENT

D. NARSINGH,
Advocate

D. C. CHOPRA,
Manager (Personnel &
Administration)

Uranium Corporation of
India Limited

Submitted on 9th
February, 1976
at Calcutta.

M. S. MURMU, General Secy.
JADUGUDA LABOUR UNION

P. N. SINGH
Petitioner-Complaint

BEFORE THE PRESIDING OFFICER
CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL
(No. 2) DHANBAD

Complaint No. 3 of 1972

(Under Section 33-A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947).

PARTIES :

Shri Ravindra Singh & Others, C/o. Jaduguda Labour Union, PO : Jaduguda Mines, Dt. Singhbhum Bihar.
—Complainant.

Vs.

M/s. Uranium Corporation of India Ltd., PO : Jaduguda Mines, Dt. Singhbhum, Bihar.

—Opposite Party.

The Petitioner of Shri P. S. Rao

The humble petitioner is one of the complainants in the above cited Complaint under section 33-A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 arising out of his dismissal from the Opposite Party's service with effect from 17-12-1971.

2. In respect of the same cause of action, viz. the petitioner's dismissal from service, for abundant caution the Opposite Party—Management has also made an application in this Tribunal under Section 33(2)(b) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, for the approval of the Tribunal of its said action.

3. The said Application of the Opposite Party management has been registered by the Tribunal as Application No. 9 of 1971.

4. The dispute involved in both the aforesaid matters, now pending in this Tribunal, has been amicably settled by mutual negotiations between the Opposite Party Management and the Complainant represented by Jaduguda Labour Union.

5. In terms of the said settlement, the Opposite Party Management had agreed to recall or withdraw its order of petitioners dismissal and to take back the petitioner in the employment of the Uranium Corporation of India Limited and to treat the period of absence as Extra-ordinary leave (non-medical).

6. The said settlement has been jointly filed by the management and petitioner in the said Application No. 9 of 1971. The said settlement may be considered as part of this record as well.

7. By virtue of the said settlement the management had prayed to the Tribunal to dispose of application in terms specified therein.

8. The petitioner who is the Opposite Party in the said Application and the said Union had agreed to the disposal of management's Application in terms of the said settlement.

9. In the circumstances, the Petitioner declares that he has no further cause of action against the management arising out of his dismissal from service except the rights conferred on him in the settlement itself.

10. The Petitioner, therefore, prays that the Tribunal may be pleased to dispose of his Complaint against the management as withdrawn.

11. Management submits that it has no objection to the Complaint being disposed of as prayed by the Petitioner.

12. The parties shall bear their respective cost of proceedings in this Complaint.

FOR THE OPPOSITE PARTY FOR THE PETITIONER
MANAGEMENT COMPLAINANT

M. S. MURMU, General Secy.
JADUGUDA LABOUR UNION

BEFORE THE PRESIDING OFFICER
CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL
(No. 2) DHANBAD
AT
CALCUTTA

Complaint No. 3 of 1972

(Under Section 33-A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947)

PARTIES :

Shri Ravindra Singh & 8 Others, C/o. Jaduguda Labour Union P.O. : Jaduguda Mines, Dt. Singhbhum Bihar

—Complainant.

Vs.

M/s. Uranium Corporation of India Ltd., P.O. : Jaduguda Mines, Dt. Singhbhum, Bihar. —Opposite Party

The Petition of Shri Suraji Sharma the humble petitioner is one of the complainants in the above cited Complaint under section 33-A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 arising out of his dismissal from the Opposite Party's service with effect from 16-12-1971.

2. In respect of the same cause of action, viz. the petitioner's dismissal from service, for abundant caution the Opposite Party-Management has also made an application in this Tribunal under Section 33(2)(b) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, for the approval of the Tribunal of its said action.

3. The said Application of the Opposite Party management has been registered by the Tribunal as Application No. 7 of 1971.

4. The dispute involved in both the aforesaid matters, now pending in this Tribunal, has been amicably settled by mutual negotiations between the Opposite Party Management and the Complainant represented by Jaduguda Labour Union.

5. In terms of the said settlement, the Opposite Party Management had agreed to recall or withdraw its order of petitioners dismissal and to take back the petitioner in the employment of the Uranium Corporation of India Limited and to treat the period of absence as Extra-ordinary leave (non-medical).

6. The said settlement has been jointly filed by the management and petitioner in the said Application No. 7 of 1971. The said settlement may be considered as part of this record as well.

7. By virtue of the said settlement the management had prayed to the Tribunal to dispose of application in terms specified therein.

8. The petitioner who is the Opposite Party in the said Application and the said Union had agreed to the disposal of management's Application in terms of the said settlement.

9. In the circumstances, the Petitioner declares that he has no further cause of action against the management arising out of his dismissal from service except the rights conferred on him in the settlement itself.

10. The Petitioner, therefore, prays that the Tribunal may be pleased to dispose of his Complaint against the management as withdrawn.

11. Management submits that it has no objection to the Complaint being disposed of as prayed by the Petitioner.

12. The parties shall bear their respective cost of proceedings in this Complaint.

FOR THE OPPOSITE PARTY FOR THE PETITIONER
MANAGEMENT COMPLAINANT

M. S. MURMU, General Secy.
Jaduguda Labour Union

BEFORE THE PRESIDING OFFICER
CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL
(No. 2) DHANBAD
AT
CALCUTTA

Complaint No. 3 of 1972

(Under Section 33-A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947)

PARTIES :

Shri Ravindra Singh & 8 Others, C/o. Jaduguda Labour Union P.O. : Jaduguda Mines, Dt. Singhbhum Bihar.

—Complainant.

Vs.

M/s. Uranium Corporation of India Ltd., P.O. : Jaduguda Mines, Dt. Singhbhum, Bihar. —Opposite Party

The Petition of Shri K. S. N. Rao the humble Petitioner is one of the complainants in the above cited Complaint under section 33-A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 arising out of his dismissal from the Opposite Party's service with effect from 27-12-1971.

2. In respect of the same cause of action, viz, the petitioner's dismissal from service, for abundant caution the Opposite Party Management has also made an application in this Tribunal under Section 33(2)(b) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, for the approval of the Tribunal of its said action.

3. The said Application of the Opposite Party management has been registered by the Tribunal as Application No. 13 of 1971.

4. The dispute involved in both the aforesaid matters, now pending in this Tribunal, has been amicably settled by mutual negotiations between the Opposite Party Management and the Complainant represented by Jaduguda Labour Union.

5. In terms of the said settlement, the Opposite Party Management had agreed to recall or withdraw its order of petitioner's dismissal and to take back the petitioner in the employment of the Uranium Corporation of India Limited and to treat the period of absence as Extraordinary leave (non-medical).

6. The said settlement has been jointly filed by the management and petitioner in the said Application No. 13 of 1971. The said settlement may be considered as part of this record as well.

7. By virtue of the said settlement the management had prayed to the Tribunal to dispose of application in terms specified therein.

8. The petitioner who is the Opposite Party in the said Application and the said Union had agreed to the disposal of management's Application in terms of the said settlement.

9. In the circumstances, the Petitioner declares that he has no further cause of action against the management arising out of his dismissal from service except the rights conferred on him in the settlement itself.

10. The Petitioner, therefore, prays that the Tribunal may be pleased to dispose of his Complaint against the management as withdrawn.

11. Management submits that it has no objection to the Complaint being disposed of as prayed by the Petitioner.

12. The parties shall bear their respective cost of proceedings in this Complaint.

FOR THE OPPOSITE
PARTY

MANAGEMENT

D. NARSINGH, Advocate

FOR THE PETITIONER
COMPLAINANT

M. S. MURMU, General Secy.

Jaduguda Labour Union

K. S. N. RAO,
Petitioner-Complainant

D. C. CHOPRA,
Manager (Personnel & Administration)
Uranium Corporation of India Limited
Submitted on 9th February, 1976
at Calcutta.

BEFORE THE PRESIDING OFFICER
CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL

(No. 2) DHANBAD

AT

CALCUTTA

Complaint No. 3 of 1972

(Under Section 33-A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947)

PARTIES :

Shri Ravindra Singh & 8 Others, C/o. Jaduguda Labour Union P.O. : Jaduguda Mines, Distt. Singhbhum Bihar.

Vs.

M/s. Uranium Corporation of India Ltd., P.O. : Jaduguda Mines, Dt. Singhbhum, Bihar. —Opposite Party

The Petition of Shri Jai Ram Hoe the humble petitioner is one of the complainants in the above cited Complaint under section 33-A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 arising out of his dismissal from the Opposite Party's service with effect from 27-12-1971.

2. In respect of the same cause of action, viz, the petitioner's dismissal from service, for abundant caution the Opposite Party-Management has also made an application in this Tribunal under Section 33(2)(b) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, for the approval of the Tribunal of its said action.

3. The said Application of the Opposite Party management has been registered by the Tribunal as Application No. 11 of 1971.

4. The dispute involved in both the aforesaid matters, now pending in this Tribunal, has been amicably settled by mutual negotiations between the Opposite Party Management and the Complainant represented by Jaduguda Labour Union.

5. In terms of the said settlement, the Opposite Party Management had agreed to recall or withdraw its order of petitioner's dismissal and to take back the petitioner in the employment of the Uranium Corporation of India Limited and to treat the period of absence as Extraordinary leave (non-medical).

6. The said settlement has been jointly filed by the management and petitioner in the said Application No. 11 of 1971. The said settlement may be considered as part of this record as well.

7. By virtue of the said settlement the management had prayed to the Tribunal to dispose of application in terms specified therein.

8. The petitioner who is the Opposite Party in the said Application and the said Union had agreed to the disposal of management's Application in terms of the said settlement.

9. In the circumstances, the Petitioner declares that he has no further cause of action against the management arising out of his dismissal from service except the rights conferred on him in the settlement itself.

10. The Petitioner, therefore, prays that the Tribunal may be pleased to dispose of his Complaint against the management as withdrawn.

11. Management submits that it has no objection to the Complaint being disposed of as prayed by the Petitioner.

12. The parties shall bear their respective cost of proceedings in this Complaint.

FOR THE OPPOSITE PARTY
MANAGEMENT

D. NARSINGH, Advocate

FOR THE PETITIONER
COMPLAINANT

M. S. MURMU, General Secy.

Jaduguda Labour Union

JAIRAM HOE
Petitioner-Complainant

[No. L-43014(1)/76 (1). D. IV (B)]

D. C. CHOPRA,
Manager (Personnel & Administration)
Uranium Corporation of India Limited
Submitted on 9th February, 1976
at Calcutta.

S.O. 2680.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal (No. 2), Dhanbad in the matter of application filed by Shri Ram Sakal Singh care of Jaduguda Labour Union, Post Office Jaduguda Mines under Section 33A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, which was received by the Central Government on the 29th June, 1976.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL
TRIBUNAL (NO. 2) AT DHANBAD

In the matter of complaint under Section 33A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

(Arising out of Reference No. 60 of 1971 referred to by the Ministry by its order No. L-29011/44/71-LR-IV dated 10-11-1971).

Complaint No. 5 of 1972

PARTIES :

Shri Ram Sakal Singh, C/o Jaduguda Labour Union,
P.O. Jaduguda Mines, Distt. Singhbhum, Bihar.

.. Complainant.

Vs.

M/s. Uranium Corporation of India Limited, P.O.
Jaduguda Mines, Dist. Singhbhum, Bihar.

.. Opp. Party.

APPEARANCES :

On behalf of the complainant.—Shri M. S. Murmu, Genl.
Secretary, Jaduguda Labour Union, P.O. Jaduguda
Mines, Dt. Singhbhum.

On behalf of the Opp. Party.—Shri D. C. Chopra,
Manager (P & A), Uranium Corporation of India
Ltd., P.O. Jaduguda Mines, Dt. Singhbhum (Bihar).

STATE : Bihar.

INDUSTRY : Uranium

Dhanbad, the 19th June, 1976

AWARD

This is an application under Section 33A of the Industrial Disputes Act 1947 filed by Shri Ram Sakal Singh against the O. P. management M/s. Uranium Corporation of India Ltd., P. O. Jaduguda Mines, Dist. Singhbhum, Bihar for necessary relief.

From the beginning the parties to the application fought tooth and nail and considerable time was lost in this contest. At long last the parties thought it was not to fight any more. On 9-2-76 when the application was fixed for hearing both sides appeared and filed a memorandum of settlement settling the dispute amicably. Sri D. C. Chopra Manager (Personnel and Administration) representing the management on the one hand and Shri M. S. Murmu, General Secretary of the Union put their signatures on the memorandum of settlement and Shri Ram Sakal Singh, the complainant put his signature on the same. The contents of the applications were verified by the signatories in relation to the memorandum of settlement. I heard both sides on the memorandum of settlement and both sides submit before me that the dispute has been amicably settled between them and pray that the application be disposed of in terms of the memorandum of settlement. I have examined the memorandum of settlement and find that the same is beneficial to the parties. The long-standing dispute has thus come to a happy conclusion. I accept the memorandum of settlement.

In the result, the application under Section 33A of the Industrial Dispute Act 1947 is disposed of in terms of the memorandum of settlement which do form part of the order.

This is my Award.

K. K. SARKAR, Presiding Officer

BEFORE THE PRESIDING OFFICER

CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL
(NO. 2) DHANBAD

AT CALCUTTA

Complaint No. 5 of 1972

(Under Section 33-A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947)

PARTIES :

Shri Ram Sakal Singh,
C/o Jaduguda Labour Union,

P.O. Jaduguda Mines, Dist. Singhbhum,
Bihar.

.. Complainant.

Vs.

M/s. Uranium Corporation of India Limited,
P.O. Jaduguda Mines, Dist. Singhbhum, Bihar.

.. Opposite Party.

The above Complaint was filed by the Complainant in this Tribunal under Section 33-A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, against the termination of his lien on the services under the Opposite Party under clause 24(c) of the Certified Standing Orders.

2. The subject matter of the dispute has since been amicably settled between the parties after prolonged negotiations between the management and the Jaduguda Labour Union, representing the complainant, to their satisfaction on the terms hereinafter stated :—

- (i) The Opposite Party, as a special case, shall take back the applicant in its employment. The period of his/her absence from work from the date on which he/she had commenced his/her unauthorised absence till the date of his/her resumption of work in terms of this settlement, shall be treated by the management as extraordinary leave (non-medical).
- (ii) In view of this settlement on the above terms the Complainant has no lawfully subsisting cause of action, to continue to pursue his/her present complaint.
- (iii) The complainant, therefore, desires to withdraw his/her present complaint in the above circumstances.
- (iv) The complainant, therefore, prays that the Tribunal may be pleased to permit him/her to withdraw his/her present complaint against the management.
- (v) It is further prayed that the Tribunal may, therefore, be pleased to dispose of the present complaint in terms of this settlement.
- (vi) The Complainant will be taken back in service on the above terms on submitting the application to the Presiding Officer, Central Government Industrial Tribunal (No. 2), Dhanbad to withdraw his/their complaints under section 33-A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.
- (vii) The management has no objection to present complaint being disposed of as prayed for.
- (viii) The parties shall bear their respective cost of proceedings in this Complaint.

For the Opposite Party

Management

D. NARSINGH, Advocate
D. C. CHOPRA,

Manager (Personnel &

Administration) Uranium Corporation of
India Limited.

Submitted on 9th February, 1976, at Calcutta.

For the Petitioner

Complainant

M. S. MURMU, Gen. Secy.
RAM SAKAL SINGH,

Petitioner-Complainant

[No. L-43014(ii)/76-D-IV(B)]

S.O. 2681.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal (No. 2), Dhanbad in the matter of application filed by Shri K. C. Mishra care of Jaduguda Labour Union, Post Office Jaduguda Mines under Section 33A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, which was received by the Central Government on the 29th June, 1976.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL
TRIBUNAL (NO. 2) AT DHANBAD

In the matter of complaint under Section 33A of the
Industrial Disputes Act, 1947

(Arising out of Reference No. 60 of 1971 referred to by the Ministry by its Order No. L-29011/44/71-LR-IV dated 10-11-1971).

Complaint No. 8 of 1972**PARTIES :**

Shri K. C. Mishra, C/o Jaduguda Labour Union, P.O. Jaduguda Mines, Dt. Singhbhum, Bihar

... Complainant.

Vs.

M/s Uranium Corporation of India Ltd., P.O. Jaduguda Mines, Dt. Singhbhum (Bihar) ... Opp. Party.

APPEARANCES :

On behalf of the complainant—Shri M. S. Murmu, Genl. Secretary, Jaduguda Labour Union, P.O. Jaduguda Mines, Dt. Singhbhum.

On behalf of the Opp. Party—Shri D. C. Chopra, Manager (P & A), Uranium Corporation of India Limited, P.O. Jaduguda Mines, Dt. Singhbhum (Bihar).

State—Bihar.

Dhanbad, the 19th June, 1976/29th Jyaistha, 1898 (Saka)

Industry : Uranium.

AWARD

The is an application under Section 33A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 filed by Shri K. C. Mishra, against the O.P. management M/s. Uranium Corporation of India Ltd., P.O. Jaduguda Mines, Dist. Singhbhum, Bihar for necessary relief.

From the beginning the parties to the application fought tooth and nail and considerable time was lost in this contest. At long last the parties thought it wise not to fight any more. On 9-2-1976 when the application was fixed for hearing both sides appeared and filed a memorandum of settlement settling the dispute amicably. Sri D. C. Chopra Manager (Personnel and Administration) representing the management on the one hand and Sri M. S. Murmu, General Secretary of the Union put their signatures on the memorandum of settlement and Shri K. C. Mishra, the complainant put his signature on the same. The contents of the application were verified by the signatories and the signature holder in relation to the memorandum of settlement. I heard both sides on the memorandum of settlement and both sides submit before me that the dispute has been amicably settled between them and pray that the application be disposed of in terms of the memorandum of settlement. I have examined the memorandum of settlement and find that the same is beneficial to the parties. The long-standing dispute has thus come to a happy conclusion. I accept the memorandum of settlement.

In the result, the application under Section 33A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 is disposed of in terms of the memorandum of settlement which do form part of the order.

This is my Award.

Sd/-

K. K. SARKAR, Presiding Officer

BEFORE THE PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (No. 2)

DHANBAD

AT

CALCUTTA

Complaint No. 8 of 1972

(Under Section 33-A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947)

PARTIES :

Shri K. C. Mishra, C/o Jaduguda Labour Union, P.O. Jaduguda Mines, Dt. Singhbhum, Bihar—Complainant

Vs.

M/s. Uranium Corporation of India Limited, P.O. Jaduguda Mines, Dt. Singhbhum (Bihar)—Opposite Party.

The above Complaint was filed by the Complainant in this Tribunal under Section 33-A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, against the termination of his lien on the services under the Opposite Party under clause 24(c) of the Certified Standing Orders.

2. The subject matter of the dispute has since been amicably settled between parties after prolonged negotiations between the management and the Jaduguda Labour Union, representing the complainant, to their satisfaction on the terms hereinafter stated :—

- (i) The Opposite Party, as a special case, shall take back the applicant in its employment. The period of his/her absence from work from the date on which he/she had commenced his/her unauthorised absence till the date of his/her resumption of work in terms of this settlement, shall be treated by the management as extraordinary leave (non-medical).
- (ii) In view of this settlement on the above terms the Complainant has not lawfully subsisting cause of action, to continue to pursue his/her present complaint.
- (iii) The complainant, therefore, desires to withdraw his/her present complaint in the above circumstances.
- (iv) The complainant, therefore, prays that the Tribunal may be pleased to permit him/her to withdraw his/her present complaint against the management.
- (v) It is further prayed that the Tribunal may, therefore, be pleased to dispose of the present complaint in terms of this settlement.
- (vi) The Complainant will be taken back in service on the above terms on submitting the application to the Presiding Officer, Central Government Industrial Tribunal (No. 2), Dhanbad to withdraw his/her complaints under section 33-A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.
- (vii) The management has no objection to present complaint being disposed of as prayed for.
- (viii) The parties shall bear their respective cost of proceedings in this Complaint.

For the Petitioner
Complainant

Management
(D. NAR SINGH)
Advocate
(D. C. CHOPRA)

(M. S. MURMU)
General Secretary
(K. C. MISHRA)

Manager (Personnel & Administration)

Uranium Corporation of India Limited

Petitioner—
Complainant

Submitted on 9th February, 1976,
at Calcutta.

[No. L 43014(1)/76-(iii)D(B)]

S.O. 2682.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal (No. 2), Dhanbad in the matter of application filed by Shri Mahabir Singh care of Jaduguda Labour Union, Post Office Jaduguda Mines under Section 33A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, which was received by the Central Government on the 29th June, 1976.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (NO. 2) AT DHANBAD

In the matter of complaint under Section 33A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947

(Arising out of Reference No. 60 of 1971 referred to by the Ministry by its Order No. L-29011/44/71-LR-IV dated 10-11-1971).

Complaint No. 6 of 1972**PARTIES :**

Shri Mahabir Singh C/o Jaduguda Labour Union, P.O.
Jaduguda Mines, Dt. Singhbhum, Bihar.

...Complainant.

Vrs.

M/s. Uranium Corporation of India Ltd., P.O. Jaduguda Mines, Dt. Singhbhum (Bihar).

...Opp. Party

APPEARANCES :

On behalf of the complainant—Shri M. S. Murmu,
Genl. Secretary, Jaduguda Labour Union, P.O.
Jaduguda Mines, Dt. Singhbhum.

On behalf of the Opp. Party—Shri D. C. Chopra,
Manager (P & A), Uranium Corporation of India
Limited, P. O. Jaduguda Mines, Dt. Singhbhum
(Bihar).

INDUSTRY : Uranium

Dhanbad, the 19th June, 1976/29th Jyaishta, 1898 (Saka)

AWARD

This is an application under Section 33A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 filed by Shri Mahabir Singh, against the O.P. management M/s. Uranium Corporation of India Ltd., P. O. Jaduguda Mines, Dist. Singhbhum, Bihar for necessary relief.

From the beginning the parties to the application fought tooth and nail and considerable time was lost in this contest. At long last the parties thought it wise not to fight any more. The parties filed a memorandum of settlement dated 10-3-1976 by post settling the dispute amicably. Sri D. C. Chopra, Manager (Personnel and Administration) representing the management on the one hand and Sri M. S. Murmu, General Secretary of the Union put their signatures on the memorandum of settlement and Shri Mahabir Singh, the complainant put his thumb impressions on the same. I have examined the memorandum of settlement and find that the same is beneficial to the parties. The long-standing dispute has thus come to a happy conclusion. I accept the memorandum of settlement.

In the result, the application under section 33A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 is disposed of in terms of the memorandum of settlement, which do form part of order.

This is my award.

K. K. SARKAR, Presiding Officer.

BEFORE THE PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL
GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (NO. 2)

DHANBAD

AT

CALCUTTA

Complaint No. 6 of 1972

(Under Section 33-A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947)

PARTIES :

Shri Mahabir Singh C/o Jaduguda Labour Union, P.O.
Jaduguda Mines, Dt. Singhbhum, Bihar—Com-
plainant

Vs.

M/s. Uranium Corporation of India Limited, P.O. Jaduguda Mines, Dt. Singhbhum (Bihar)—Opposite
Party.

The above Complaint was filed by the Complainant in this Tribunal under Section 33-A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, against the termination of his lien on the services under the Opposite Party under clause 24(c) of the Certified Standing Orders.

47 GI/76—9.

2. The subject matter of the dispute has since been amicably settled between parties after prolonged negotiations between the management and the Jaduguda Labour Union, representing the complainant, to their satisfaction on the terms hereinafter state :—

- (i) The Opposite Party, as a special case, shall take back the applicant in its employment. The period of his/her absence from work from the date on which he/she had commenced his/her unauthorised absence till the date of his/her resumption of work in terms of this settlement, shall be treated by the management as extraordinary leave (non-medical).
- (ii) In view of this settlement on the above terms the Complainant has not lawfully subsisting cause of action, to continue to pursue his/her present complaint.
- (iii) The complainant, therefore, desires to withdraw his/her present complaint in the above circumstances.
- (iv) The complainant, therefore, prays that the Tribunal may be pleased to permit him/her to withdraw his/her present complaint against the management.
- (v) It is further prayed that the Tribunal may, therefore, be pleased to dispose of the present complaint in terms of this settlement.
- (vi) The Complainant will be taken back in service on the above terms on submitting the application to the Presiding Officer, Central Government Industrial Tribunal (No. 2), Dhanbad to withdraw his/her complaints under section 33-A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.
- (vii) The management has no objection to present complaint being disposed of as prayed for.
- (viii) The parties shall bear their respective cost of proceedings in this Complaint.

For the Petitioner
Complainant

For the Opposite Party
Management

(M. S. MURMU),
General Secretary

(D. C. CHOPRA)
Manager (Personnel & Administration)
Uranium Corporation of India Limited

(Thumb Impression)
(MAHABIR SINGH)

Petitioner—
Complainant

Submitted at Jaduguda on 10th March,
1976

[No. L-43014(I)/176-(iv)-D IV(B)]

S.O. 2683.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal (No. 2), Dhanbad in the matter of application filed by Shri Ramayya Hembram care of Jaduguda Labour Union, Post Office Jaduguda Mines under Section 33A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, which was received by the Central Government on the 29th June, 1976.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL
TRIBUNAL (NO. 2) AT DHANBAD

In the matter of complaint under Section 33A of the
Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

(Arising out of Reference No. 60 of 1971 referred to
by the Ministry by its order No. L-29011/44/71-LR-
IV dated 10-11-1971).

Complaint No. 9 of 1972**PARTIES :**

Shri Ramayya Hembram, C/o. Jaduguda Labour Union,
P.O. Jaduguda Mines, Dt. Singhbhum, Bihar.
... Complainant.

Vrs.

M/s. Uranium Corporation of India Ltd., P.O. Jaduguda
Mines, Dt. Singhbhum (Bihar). ... Opp. Party.

APPEARANCES :

On behalf of the complainant—Shri M. S. Murmu, Genl.
Secretary, Jaduguda Labour Union, P. O. Jaduguda
Mines, Dt. Singhbhum.

On behalf of the Opp. Party.—Shri D. C. Chopra, Ma-
nager (P & A), Uranium Corporation of India Ltd.,
P. O. Jaduguda Mines, Dt. Singhbhum (Bihar).

STATE Bihar,

Dhanbad, 19th June, 1976

AWARD

This is an application under Section 33A of the Industrial
Disputes Act 1947 filed by Shri Ramayya Hembram, against
the O. P. management M/s. Uranium Corporation of India
Ltd., P. O. Jaduguda Mines, Dist. Singhbhum, Bihar for ne-
cessary relief.

From the beginning the parties to the application fought
tooth and nail and considerable time was lost in this contest.
At long last the parties thought it wise not to fight any
more. On 9-2-1976 when the application was fixed for hearing
both sides appeared and filed a memorandum of settlement
settling the dispute amicably. Sri D. C. Chopra Manager
(Personnel and Administration) representing the management
on the one hand and Sri M. S. Murmu, General Secretary of
the Union put their signatures on the memorandum of settle-
ment and Shri Ramayya Hembram, the complainant put his
thumb impressions on the same. The contents of the appli-
cation were verified by the signatories and the thumb im-
pression holder in relation to the memorandum of settlement.
I heard both sides on the memorandum of settlement and
both sides submit before me that the dispute has been amicably
settled between them and pray that the application be disposed
of in terms of the memorandum of settlement. I have
examined the memorandum of settlement and find that the
same is beneficial to the parties. The longstanding dispute
has thus come to a happy conclusion. I accept the memo-
randum of settlement.

In the result, the application under Section 33A of the
Industrial Disputes Act 1947 is disposed of in terms of the
memorandum of settlement, which do form part of the order.

This is my Award.

K. K. SARKAR, Presiding Officer.

**BEFORE THE PRESIDING OFFICER
CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL**

(NO. 2) DHANBAD

**AT
CALCUTTA**

Complaint No. 9 of 1972

(Under Section 33-A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947).

PARTIES :

Shri Ramayya Hembram, C/o. Jaduguda Labour Union,
PO : Jaduguda Mines, Dt. Singhbhum,
Bihar. ... Complainant

Vs.

M/s. Uranium Corporation of India Limited, PO :
Jaduguda Mines, Dt. Singhbhum (Bihar).
... Opposite Party.

The above Complaint was filed by the Complainant in this
Tribunal under Section 33-A of the Industrial Disputes Act,
1947, against the termination of his lien on the services under
the Opposite Party under clause 24(c) of the Certified Stand-
ing Orders.

2. The subject matter of the dispute has since been amicably
settled between the parties after prolonged negotiations be-
tween the management and the Jaduguda Labour Union, re-
presenting the complainant, to their satisfaction on the terms
hereinafter stated :—

- (i) The Opposite Party, as a special case, shall take
back the applicant in its employment. The period
of his/her absence from work from the date on
which he/she had commenced his/her unauthorised
absence till the date of his/her resumption of work
in terms of this settlement, shall be treated by the
management as extraordinary leave (non-medical).
- (ii) In view of this settlement on the above terms the
Complainant has not lawfully subsisting cause of
action, to continue to pursue his/her present com-
plaint.
- (iii) The complainant, therefore, desires to withdraw his/
her present complaint in the above circumstances.
- (iv) The complainant, therefore, prays that the Tribunal
may be pleased to permit him/her to withdraw his/
her present complaint against the management.
- (v) It is further prayed that the Tribunal may, therefore,
be pleased to dispose of the present complaint in
terms of this settlement.
- (vi) The Complainant will be taken back in service on
the above terms on submitting the application to
the Presiding Officer, Central Government Industrial
Tribunal (No. 2), Dhanbad to withdraw his/their
complaints under section 33-A of the Industrial Dis-
putes Act, 1947.
- (vii) The management has no objection to present com-
plaint being disposed of as prayed for.
- (viii) The parties shall bear their respective cost of pro-
ceedings in this Complaint.

For the Opposite Party
Management

For the Petitioner
Complainant

D. NARSINGH, Advocate. M. S. MURMU, General Secy.
D. C. CHOPRA, Manager (Personnel & Admn.)
Uranium Corporation of India Limited.

LTi of Shri Ramayya Hembram.

Petitioner-Complainant.

Submitted on 9th February, 1976, at Calcutta.

[No. L. 43014(1)/76(V)-D-IV(B)]

S.O. 2684.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial
Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government
hereby publishes the following award of the Central Gov-
ernment Industrial Tribunal (No. 2), Dhanbad in the matter
of applications filed by Shri R. P. Pandey and others care
of Jaduguda Labour Union, Post Office Jaduguda Mines
under Section 33A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947,
which was received by the Central Government on the 29th
June, 1976.

**BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL
TRIBUNAL (NO. 2) AT DHANBAD**

In the matter of complaint under Section 33A of the Indus-
trial Disputes Act, 1947.

(Arising out of Reference No. 60 of 1971 referred to by
the Ministry by its Order No. L-29011/44/71-LR-IV
dated 10-11-1971)

Complaint No. 2 of 1972

-VS-

PARTIES :

Shri R. P. Pandey & others, C/o Jaduguda Labour Union, P.O. Jaduguda Mines, Dist. Singhbhum, Bihar
..Complainant

Vs.

M/s. Uranium Corporation of India Limited, P.O. Jaduguda Mines, Dist. Singhbhum (Bihar).

...Opp. Party

M/s. Uranium Corporation of India Limited,
P.O. Jaduguda Mines, Dt. Singhbhum,
Bihar
..Opposite Party.

The Petition of Shri M. S. Murmu.

The above Complaint was filed by the Complainant in this Tribunal under Section 33-A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, against the termination of his services under the Opposite Party under clause 31(b) of the Certified Standing Orders.

APPEARANCES :

On behalf of the complainant.—Shri M. S. Murmu, Genl. Secretary, Jaduguda Labour Union, P. O. Jaduguda Mines., Dt Singhbhum.

On behalf of the Opp. Party.—Shri D. C. Chopra, Manager (P & A), Uranium Corporation of India Limited, P.O. Jaduguda Mines, Dist. Singhbhum (Bihar).

STATE: Bihar.

Dhanbad, the 19th June, 1976

AWARD

This is an application under Section 33A of the Industrial Disputes Act filed by Sri R. P. Pandey and three others viz. Sri M. S. Murmu, Sri Soma Biruli and Sri Mohan Karmakar. Sri Soma Biruli and Sri Mohan Karmakar as far back as 14-2-72 withdrew their complaint by a joint application on the ground that there is no merit in their case. It appears that Sri P. K. Bose, Advocate representing the workmen verified the contents as correct. The case proceeded against Sri R. P. Pandey and Sri M. S. Murmu the other two applicants. The case proceeded along its course for a long time for some reason or other. At long last, the two contesting applicants and the O. P. management thought it wise not to fight any more. On 9-2-76, the two contesting applicants and the O. P. management appeared and filed two memorandum of settlement, settling the dispute amicably. Sri D. C. Chopra Manager (Personnel and Administration) representing the management and Sri M. S. Murmu as workman concerned and as General Secretary of the Union signed the memorandum of settlement. Again Sri D. C. Chopra for the management and Sri M. S. Murmu as General Secretary of the Union signed the other memorandum of settlement. The parties as above also verified the contents of the memorandum of settlement as correct. I heard the parties on the same and both sides submit that the dispute has been amicably settled and pray that the application be disposed of accordingly. I have examined the two memorandum of settlement which appear to be beneficial to all sides. I, therefore, accept the same.

In the result, the application under Section 33A of the I.D. Act 1947 is disposed of in terms of the two memorandum of settlements which do form part of the order.

This is my Award.

K. K. SARKAR, Presiding Officer

**BEFORE THE PRESIDING OFFICER
CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL
(NO. 2) DHANBAD
AT CALCUTTA**

Complaint No. 2 of 1972

(Under Section 33-A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947).

PARTIES :

Shri R. P. Pandey & Others,
C/o Jaduguda Labour Union,
P.O. Jaduguda Mines, Dt. Singhbhum,
Bihar
Complainant.

-VS-

M/s. Uranium Corporation of India Limited,
P.O. Jaduguda Mines, Dt. Singhbhum,
Bihar.
.. Opposite Party.

2. The subject matter of the dispute has since been amicably settled between the parties after prolonged negotiations between the management and the Jaduguda Labour Union, representing the complainant, to their satisfaction on the terms hereinafter stated :—

- (i) The Opposite Party, as a special case, shall take back the applicant in its employment. The period of his/her absence from work from the date on which he/she had commenced his/her unauthorised absence till the date of his/her resumption of work in terms of this settlement, shall be treated by the management as extraordinary leave (non-medical).
- (ii) In view of this settlement on the above terms the Complainant has no lawfully subsisting cause of action, to continue to pursue his/her present complaint.
- (iii) The complainant, therefore, desires to withdraw his/her present complaint in the above circumstances.
- (iv) The complainant, therefore, prays that the Tribunal may be pleased to permit him/her to withdraw his/her present complaint against the management.
- (v) It is further prayed that the Tribunal may, therefore, be pleased to dispose of the present complaint in terms of this settlement.
- (vi) The Complainant will be taken back in service on the above terms on submitting the application to the Presiding Officer, Central Government Industrial Tribunal (No. 2), Dhanbad to withdraw his/their complaints under section 33-A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.
- (vii) The management has no objection to present complaint being disposed of as prayed for.
- (viii) The parties shall bear their respective cost of proceedings in this Complaint.

| | |
|---|--|
| For the Opposite Party Management | For the Petitioner Complainant |
| D. NARSINGH, Advocate | M. S. MURMU, Genl. Secy. |
| D. C. CHOPRA, Manager (Personnel & Administration) | M. S. MURMU, Petitioner-Complainant |
| Uranium Corporation of India Limited. | |
| Submitted on 9th February, 1976, at Calcutta. | |

**BEFORE THE PRESIDING OFFICER
CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL
(NO. 2) DHANBAD
AT CALCUTTA**

Complaint No. 2 of 1972

(Under Section 33-A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947)

PARTIES :

Shri R. P. Pandey & Others,
C/o Jaduguda Labour Union,
P.O. Jaduguda Mines, Dt. Singhbhum,
Bihar
..Complainant.

-VS-

The Petition of Shri R. P. Pandey.

The above Complaint was filed by the Complainant in this Tribunal under Section 33-A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, against the termination of his services under the Opposite Party under clause 31(b) of the Certified Standing Orders.

2. The subject matter of the dispute has since been amicably settled between the parties after prolonged negotiations between the management and the Jaduguda Labour Union, representing the complainant, to their satisfaction on the terms hereinafter stated :—

- (i) The Opposite Party, as a special case, shall take back the applicant in its employment. The period of his/her absence from work from the date on which he/she had commenced his/her unauthorised absence till the date of his/her resumption of work in terms of this settlement, shall be treated by the management as extraordinary leave (non-medical).
- (ii) In view of this settlement on the above terms the Complainant has no lawfully subsisting cause of action, to continue to pursue his/her present complaint.
- (iii) The complainant, therefore, desires to withdraw his/her present complaint in the above circumstances.
- (iv) The complainant, therefore, prays that the Tribunal may be pleased to permit him/her to withdraw his/her present complaint against the management.
- (v) It is further prayed that the Tribunal may, therefore, be pleased to dispose of the present complaint in terms of this settlement.
- (vi) The Complainant will be taken back in service on the above terms on submitting the application to the Presiding Officer, Central Government Industrial Tribunal (No. 2), Dhanbad to withdraw his/her complaints under section 33-A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.
- (vii) The management has no objection to present complaint being disposed of as prayed for.
- (viii) The parties shall bear their respective cost of proceedings in this Complaint.

For the Opposite Party

Management

D. NARSINGH, Advocate
D. C. CHOPRA, Manager
(Personnel & Administration)
Uranium Corporation of India Limited.

For the Petitioner
Complainant

M. S. MURMU, Genl. Secy.
R. P. PANDEY,
Petitioner-Complainant

Submitted on 9th February, 1976, at Calcutta.

[No. L-43014(1)/76-(VI)-D-IV(B)]

S.O. 2685.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal (No. 2), Dhanbad in the matter of application filed by Shri Birinchi Mukhi care of Jaduguda Labour Union, Post Office Jaduguda Mines under Section 33A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, which was received by the Central Government on the 29th June, 1976.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (NO. 2) AT DHANBAD

In the matter of complaint under Section 33A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947—
(Arising out of Reference No. 60 of 1971 referred to by the Ministry by its order No. L-29011/44/71-LR-IV dated 10-11-1971).

Complaint No. 7 of 1972

PARTIES :

Shri Birinchi Mukhi, C/o Jaduguda Labour Union,
P. O. Jaduguda Mines, Dt. Singhbhum, Bihar.
.. Complainant.

Vrs.

M/s. Uranium Corporation of India Ltd., P. O. Jaduguda Mines, Dt. Singhbhum (Bihar).
.. Opp. Party.

APPEARANCES :

On behalf of the complainant.—Shri M.S. Murmu, Genl. Secretary, Jaduguda Labour Union, P.O. Jaduguda Mines, Dt. Singhbhum.

On behalf of the Opp. Party.—Shri D. C. Chopra, Manager (P & A), Uranium Corporation of India Limited, P. O. Jaduguda Mines, Dt. Singhbhum (Bihar).

STATE : Bihar.

INDUSTRY : Uranium.

Dhanbad, the 19th June, 1976

AWARD

This is an application under Section 33A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 filed by Shri Birinchi Mukhi, against the O. P. management M/s. Uranium Corporation of India Ltd., P.O. Jaduguda Mines, Dist. Singhbhum, Bihar for necessary relief.

From the beginning the parties to the application fought tooth and nail and considerable time was lost in this contest. At long last the parties thought it wise not to fight any more 9-2-76 when the application was fixed for hearing both sides appeared and filed a memorandum of settlement settling the dispute amicably. Sri D. C. Chopra Manager (Personnel and Administration) representing the management on the one hand and Sri M. S. Murmu, General Secretary of the Union put their signatures on the memorandum of settlement and Shri Birinchi Mukhi, the complainant put his thumb impressions on the same. The contents of the application were verified by the signatories and the thumb impression holder in relation to the memorandum of settlement. I heard both sides on the memorandum of settlement and both sides submit before me that the dispute has been amicably settled between them and pray that the application be disposed of in terms of the memorandum of settlement. I have examined the memorandum of settlement and find that the same is beneficial to the parties. The longstanding dispute has thus come to a happy conclusion. I accept the memorandum of settlement.

In the result, the application under Section 33A of the Industrial Disputes Act 1947 is disposed of in terms of the memorandum of settlement, which do form part of order.

This is my Award.

K. K. SARKAR, Presiding Officer

**BEFORE THE PRESIDING OFFICER
CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL
(NO. 2) DHANBAD
AT CALCUTTA**

Complaint No. 7 of 1972.

(Under Section 33-A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947)

PARTIES :

Shri Birinchi Mukhi,
C/o Jaduguda Labour Union,
P.O. Jaduguda Mines, Dt. Singhbhum,
Bihar.
.. Complainant.

Vs.

M/s. Uranium Corporation of India Limited,
P.O. Jaduguda Mines, Dt. Singhbhum,
Bihar.
.. Opposite Party.

The above Complaint was filed by the Complainant in this Tribunal under Section 33-A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, against the termination of his lien on the services under the Opposite Party under clause 24(c) of the Certified Standing Orders.

2. The subject matter of the dispute has since been amicably settled between the parties after prolonged negotiations between the management and the Jaduguda Labour Union, representing the complainant, to their satisfaction on the terms hereinafter stated :—

- (i) The Opposite Party, as a special case, shall take back the applicant in its employment. The period of his/her absence from work from the date on which he/she had commenced his/her unauthorised absence till the date of his/her resumption of work in terms of this settlement, shall be treated by the management as extraordinary leave (non-medical).
- (ii) In view of this settlement on the above terms the Complainant has no lawfully subsisting cause of action, to continue to pursue his/her present complaint.
- (iii) The complainant, therefore, desires to withdraw his/her present complaint in the above circumstances.
- (iv) The complainant, therefore, prays that the Tribunal may be pleased to permit him/her to withdraw his/her present complaint against the management.
- (v) It is further prayed that the Tribunal may, therefore, be pleased to dispose of the present complaint in terms of this settlement.
- (vi) The Complainant will be taken back in service on the above terms on submitting the application to the Presiding Officer, Central Government Industrial Tribunal (No. 2), Dhanbad to withdraw his/their complaints under section 33-A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.
- (vii) The management has no objection to present complaint being disposed of as prayed for.
- (viii) The parties shall bear their respective cost of proceedings in this Complaint.

For the Opposite Party
Management

For the Petitioner
Complainant

Dr. NARSINGH, Advocate M. S. MURMU, Genl. Secy.
D. C. CHOPRA, Manager M. S. MURMU,

(Personnel & Administration) Petitioner-Complainant
Uranium Corporation of India Limited.

LTI of Shri Birinchi Mukhi
BIRINCHI MUKHI,

Submitted on 9th February, 1976, at Calcutta.

[No. 43014(1)/76-(VII)-D. IV(B)]

S.O. 2686.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal (No. 2), Dhanbad in the matter of applications filed by Shri N. C. Giri and three others care of Jaduguda Labour Union, Post Office Jaduguda Mines under Section 33A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, which was received by the Central Government on the 29 June, 1976.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (NO. 2) AT DHANBAD

In the matter of complaint under Section 33A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

(Arising out of Reference No. 60 of 1971 referred to by the Ministry by its order No. L-29011/44/71-LR-IV dated 10-11-1971).

Complaint No. 4 of 1972.

PARTIES :

S/Shri N. C. Giri and 3 others C/o Jaduguda Labour Union, P.O. Jaduguda Mines, Dt. Singhbhum, Bihar.

—Complainant.

Vrs.

M/s. Uranium Corporation of India Ltd., P.O. Jaduguda Mines, Dt. Singhbhum (Bihar)

—Opp. Party.

APPEARANCES :

On behalf of the complainant—Shri M. S. Murmu, Genl. Secretary, Jaduguda Labour Union, P.O. Jaduguda Mines Dt. Singhbhum.

On behalf of the Opp. Party—Shri D. C. Chopra, Manager (P & A), Uranium Corporation of India Limited, P.O. Jaduguda Mines, Dt. Singhbhum (Bihar).

INDUSTRY : Uranium.

Dhanbad, 19th June, 1976

AWARD

These are four applications under Section 33A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 filed by S/Shri N. C. Giri, Gopal Majhi, Asen Majhi and Rama Kant Kumar, against the O. P. management M/s. Uranium Corporation of India Ltd, P.O. Jaduguda Mines, Dist. Singhbhum, Bihar for necessary relief.

From the beginning the parties to the applications fought tooth and nail and considerable time was lost in the contest. At long last the parties thought it wise not to fight any more. Three memorandums of settlement was filed on 9-2-1976 and one memorandum of settlement was received by post settling the dispute amicably. Shri D. C. Chopra Manager (Personnel and Administration) signed all the memorandum of settlement for the Employers and Shri M. S. Murmu, General Secretary of the Union signed all the memorandum of settlement for workmen. The complaints Shri N. C. Giri and Sri Rama Kant Kumar also signed the memorandum of settlement and Sri Gopal Majhi and Asen Majhi put their thumb impressions on the same. I heard both sides on the memorandum of settlement and both sides submit before me that the dispute has been amicably settled between them and pray that the application be disposed of in terms of the memorandum of settlement I have examined the memorandum of settlement and find that the same are beneficial to the parties. The long standing dispute has thus come to a happy conclusion. I accept the memorandum of settlement.

In the result, the applications under section 33A of the Industrial Disputes Act 1947 filed by S/Shri N. C. Giri, 2 Gopal Majhi, 3. Asen Majhi and 4. Rama Kant Kumar are disposed of in terms of the memorandum of settlement which do from part of order.

This is my Award.

K. K. SARKAR, Presiding Officer.

BEFORE THE PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (NO. 2), DHANBAD

AT

CALCUTTA

Complaint No. 4 of 1972

(Under Section 33-A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947)

PARTIES :

Shri N. C. Giri & 3 others C/o. Jaduguda Labour Union, P.O. Jaduguda Mines, Dt. Singhbhum, Bihar.

—Complainant.

Vs.

M/s. Uranium Corporation of India Ltd., P.O. Jaduguda, Mines, Dt. Singhbhum, Bihar

—Opposite Party.

The Petition of Shri N. C. Giri.

The humble petitioner is one of the complainants in the above cited Complaint under section 33-A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 arising out of his dismissal from the Opposite Party's service with effect from 11-2-1972.

2. In respect of the same cause of action, viz. the petitioner's dismissal from service, for abundant caution the Opposite Party-Management has also made an application in this Tribunal under Section 33(2)(b) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, for the approval of the Tribunal of its said action.

3. The said Application of the Opposite Party management has been registered by the Tribunal as Application No. 4 of 1972.

4. The dispute involved in both the aforesaid matters, now pending in this Tribunal, has been amicably settled by mutual negotiations between the Opposite Party Management and the Complainant represented by Jaduguda Labour Union.

5. In terms of the said settlement, the Opposite Party Management had agreed to recall or withdraw its order of petitioner's dismissal and to take back the petitioner in the employment of the Uranium Corporation of India Limited and to treat the period of absence as Extra-ordinary leave (non-medical).

6. The said settlement has been jointly filed by the management and petitioner in the said Application No. 4 of 1972. The said settlement may be considered as part of this record as well.

7. By virtue of the said settlement the management had prayed to the Tribunal to dispose of application in terms specified therein.

8. The petitioner who is the Opposite Party in the said Application and the said Union had agreed to the disposal of management's Application in terms of the said settlement.

9. In the circumstances, the Petitioner declares that he has no further cause of action against the management arising out of his dismissal from service except the rights conferred on him in the settlement itself.

10. The Petitioner, therefore, prays that the Tribunal may be pleased to dispose of his Complaint against the management as withdrawn.

11. Management submits that it has no objection to the Complaint being disposed of as prayed by the Petitioner.

12. The parties shall bear their respective cost of proceedings in this Complaint.

For the Opposite Party

Management
Sd/-

D. NARSINGH, Advocate.

Sd/-

D. C. CHOPRA,
Manager (Personnel & Adm.)
Uranium Corporation of India Limited

Submitted on 9th February, 1976
at Calcutta.

BEFORE THE PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (NO. 2) DHANBAD
AT
CALCUTTA

Complaint No. 4 of 1972

(Under Section 33-A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947)

PARTIES :

Shri N. C. Giri & 3 Others, C/o. Jaduguda Labour Union, P.O. Jaduguda Mines, Dt. Singhbhum, Bihar.

—Complainant

Vs.

M/s. Uranium Corporation of India Limited, P.O. Jaduguda Mines, Dt. Singhbhum (Bihar).

—Opposite Party.

The Petition of Shri Rama Kant Kumar.

The above Complaint was filed by the Complainant in this Tribunal under Section 33-A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, against the termination of his lien on the services under the Opposite Party under clause 24(c) of the Certified Standing Orders.

2. The subject matter of the dispute has since been amicably settled between the parties after prolonged negotiations between the management and the Jaduguda Labour Union, representing the complainant, to their satisfaction on the terms hereinafter stated :—

(i) The Opposite Party, as a special case, shall take back the applicant in its employment. The period of his/her absence from work from the date on which he/she had commenced his/her unauthorised absence till the date of his/her resumption of work in terms of this settlement, shall be treated by the management as extraordinary leave (non-medical).

(ii) In view of this settlement on the above terms the Complainant has no lawfully subsisting cause of action, to continue to pursue his/her present complaint.

(iii) The complainant, therefore, desires to withdraw his/her present complaint in the above circumstances.

(iv) The complainant, therefore, prays that the Tribunal may be pleased to permit him/her to withdraw his/her present complaint against the management.

(v) It is further prayed that the Tribunal may, therefore, be pleased to dispose of the present complaint in terms of this settlement.

(vi) The Complainant will be taken back in service on the above terms on submitting the application to the Presiding Officer, Central Government Industrial Tribunal (No. 2), Dhanbad to withdraw his/their complaints under section 33-A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

(vii) The management has no objection to present complaint being disposed of as prayed for.

(viii) The parties shall bear their respective cost of proceedings in this Complaint.

For the Opposite Party

Management
Sd/-

D. C. CHOPRA.

Manager (Personnel & Adm.)
Uranium Corporation of India Limited.

For the Petitioner

Complainant
Sd/-

M. S. MURMU,

General Secy.

RAMA KANT KUMAR,
Petitioner-Complainant.

9th February, 1976, Calcutta.

Place : Jaduguda Mines.

Date : 25-2-1976.

BEFORE THE PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (NO. 2) DHANBAD
AT
CALCUTTA

Complaint No. 4 of 1972

(Under Section 33-A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947)

PARTIES :

Shri N. C. Giri & 3 Others, C/o. Jaduguda Labour Union, P.O. Jaduguda Mines, Dt. Singhbhum, Bihar.

—Complainant

Vs.

M/s. Uranium Corporation of India Limited, P.O. Jaduguda Mines, Dt. Singhbhum (Bihar).

—Opposite Party.

The Petition of Shri Oshen Majhi.

The above Complaint was filed by the Complainant in this Tribunal under Section 33-A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, against the termination of his lien on the services under the Opposite Party under clause 24(c) of the Certified Standing Orders.

2. The subject matter of the dispute has since been amicably settled between the parties after prolonged negotiations between the management and the Jaduguda Labour Union, representing the complainant, to their satisfaction on the terms hereinafter stated :—

- (i) The Opposite Party, as a special case, shall take back the applicant in its employment. The period of his/her absence from work from the date on which he/she had commenced his/her unauthorised absence till the date of his/her resumption of work in terms of this settlement, shall be treated by the management as extraordinary leave (non-medical).
- (ii) In view of this settlement on the above terms the Complainant has no lawfully subsisting cause of action, to continue to pursue his/her present complaint.
- (iii) The complainant, therefore, desires to withdraw his/her present complaint in the above circumstances.
- (iv) The complainant, therefore, prays that the Tribunal may be pleased to permit him/her to withdraw his/her present complaint against the management.
- (v) It is further prayed that the Tribunal may, therefore, be pleased to dispose of the present complaint in terms of this settlement.
- (vi) The Complainant will be taken back in service on the above terms on submitting the application to the Presiding Officer, Central Government Industrial Tribunal (No. 2), Dhanbad to withdraw his/their complaints under section 33-A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.
- (vii) The management has no objection to present complaint being disposed of as prayed for.
- (viii) The parties shall bear their respective cost of proceedings in this Complaint.

For the Opposite Party
Management

D. NARSINGH,
Advocate

Sd/-

D. C. CHOPRA,
Manager (Personnel & Adm.)
Uranium Corporation of India Limited.

Submitted on 9th February, 1976
at Calcutta.

BEFORE THE PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (NO. 2) DHANBAD
AT
CALCUTTA

Complaint No. 4 of 1972

(Under Section 33-A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947)
PARTIES :

Shri N. C. Giri & 3 Others, C/o. Jaduguda Labour Union, P.O. Jaduguda Mines, Dist. Singhbhum, Bihar

—Complainant

Vs.

M/s. Uranium Corporation of India Limited, P.O. Jaduguda Mines, Dist. Singhbhum (Bihar)

—Opposite Party.

The Petition of Shri Gopal Majhi.

The above Complaint was filed by the Complainant in this Tribunal under Section 33-A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, against the termination of his lien on the services under the Opposite Party under clause 24(c) of the Certified Standing Orders.

2. The subject matter of the dispute has since been amicably settled between the parties after prolonged negotiations between the management and the Jaduguda Labour Union, representing the complainant, to their satisfaction on the terms hereinafter stated :—

- (i) The Opposite Party, as a special case, shall take back the applicant in its employment. The period of his/her absence from work from the date on which he/she had commenced his/her unauthorised absence till the date of his/her resumption of work in terms of this settlement, shall be treated by the management as extraordinary leave (non-medical).

- (ii) In view of this settlement on the above terms the Complainant has no lawfully subsisting cause of action, to continue to pursue his/her present complaint.
- (iii) The complainant, therefore, desires to withdraw his/her present complaint in the above circumstances.
- (iv) The complainant, therefore, prays that the Tribunal may be pleased to permit him/her to withdraw his/her present complaint against the management.
- (v) It is further prayed that the Tribunal may, therefore, be pleased to dispose of the present complaint in terms of this settlement.
- (vi) The Complainant will be taken back in service on the above terms on submitting the application to the Presiding Officer, Central Government Industrial Tribunal (No. 2), Dhanbad to withdraw his/their complaints under section 33-A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.
- (vii) The management has no objection to present complaint being disposed of as prayed for.
- (viii) The parties shall bear their respective cost of proceedings in this Complaint.

For the Opposite Party

Management

D. NARSINGH
Advocate

D. C. CHOPRA,
Manager (Personnel & Adm.)
Uranium Corporation of India Limited.

For the Petitioner
Complainant

M. S. MURMU,
General Secy.

GOPAL MAJHI,
Petitioner-Complainant.

Submitted on 9th February, 1976,
at Calcutta.

[No. L-43014(1)/76(viii)-DIV(B)]

S.O. 2687.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal (No. 2), Dhanbad in the matter of applications filed by Shrimati Singhoo and Salgi care of Jaduguda Labour Union, Post Office Jaduguda Mines under Section 33A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, which was received by the Central Government on the 29th June, 1976.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (NO. 2) AT DHANBAD

PRESENT :

Shri K. K. Sarkar, Judge, Presiding Officer.

In the matter of complaint under Section 33A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

(Arising out of Reference No. 60 of 1971 referred to by the Ministry by its order No. L-29011/44/71-LR-IV dated 10-11-1971).

Complaint No. 1 of 1972

PARTIES :

Smt. Singhoo and Salgi, C/o. Jaduguda Labour Union, P.O. Jaduguda Mines, Dt. Singhbhum, Bihar

... Complainant.

Vs.

M/s. Uranium Corporation of India Limited, P.O. Jaduguda Mines, Dt. Singhbhum (Bihar).

... Oppo. Party.

APPEARANCES :

On behalf of the complainant—Shri M. S. Murmu, Genl. Secretary, Jaduguda Labour Union, P.O. Jaduguda Mines, Dt. Singhbhum.

On behalf of the Opposite Party—Shri D. C. Chopra, Manager (P&A), Uranium Corporation of India Limited, P. O. Jaduguda Mines, Dt. Singhbhum (Bihar).

State : Bihar.

Industry : Uranium.

Dhanbad, 19th June, 1970.

AWARD

This is an application under Section 33A of the Industrial Disputes Act 1947 filed by Smt. Singhoo and Salgi, the two workmen, against the O. P. management M/s. Uranium Corporation of India Ltd., P. O. Jaduguda Mines, Dist. Singhbhum, Bihar for necessary relief.

From the beginning the parties to the application fought tooth and nail and considerable time was lost in this contest. At long last the parties thought it wise not to fight any more. On 9-2-76 when the application was fixed for hearing both sides appeared and filed two memorandum of settlement settling the dispute amicably. Shri D. C. Chopra, Manager (Personnel and Administration) representing the management on the one hand and Sri M. S. Murmu, General Secretary of the Union put their signatures on the two memorandum of settlement and Smt. Singhoo and Smt. Salgi the two complainants put their thumb impressions on the same. The contents of the applications were verified by the signatories and the thumb impression holders in relation to the two memorandum of settlement. I heard both sides on the memorandum of settlement and both sides submit before me that the dispute has been amicably settled between them and pray that the application be disposed of in terms of the two memorandum of settlements. I have examined the two memorandum of settlement and find that the same is beneficial to the parties. The long-standing dispute has thus come to a happy conclusion. I accept the memorandum of settlement.

In the result, the application under Section 33A of the Industrial Dispute Act 1947 is disposed of in terms of the memorandum of the two memorandum of settlements, which do form part of the order.

This is my Award.

K. K. SARKAR, Presiding Officer

BEFORE THE PRESIDING OFFICER CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (NO. 2)
DHANBAD AT CALCUTTA

Complaint No. 1 of 1972

(Under Section 33-A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947)

PARTIES:

Smt. Singhoo & Salgi, C/o. Jaduguda Labour Union,
P. O. Jaduguda Mines, Dt. Singhbhum, Bihar.

... Complainant.

Vs.

M/s. Uranium Corporation of India Limited, P. O.
Jaduguda Mines, Dt. Singhbhum (Bihar)

... Opposite Party.

The Petition of Smt. Singhoo

The above Complaint was filed by the Complainant in this Tribunal under Section 33-A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, against the termination of his lien on the services under the Opposite Party under clause 24(c) of the Certified Standing Orders.

2. The subject matter of the dispute has since been amicably settled between the parties after prolonged negotiations between the management and the Jaduguda Labour Union, representing the complainant, to their satisfaction on the terms hereinafter stated:—

- (i) The Opposite Party, as a special case, shall take back the applicant in its employment. The period of his/her absence from work from the date on which he/she had commenced his/her unauthorised absence till the date of his/her resumption of work in terms of this settlement, shall be treated by the management as extraordinary leave (non-medical).
- (ii) In view of this settlement on the above terms the Complainant has not lawfully subsisting cause of action, to continue to pursue his/her present complaint.
- (iii) The complainant, therefore, desires to withdraw his/her present complaint in the above circumstances.
- (iv) The complainant, therefore, prays that the Tribunal may be pleased to permit him/her to withdraw his/her present complaint against the management.
- (v) It is further prayed that the Tribunal may, therefore, be pleased to dispose of the present complaint in terms of this settlement.
- (vi) The Complainant will be taken back in service on the above terms on submitting the application to the Presiding Officer, Central Government Industrial Tribunal (No. 2), Dhanbad to withdraw his/their complaints under section 33-A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

(vii) The management has no objection to present complaint being disposed of as prayed for.

(viii) The parties shall bear their respective cost of proceedings in this Complaint.

For the Opposite Party
Management

D. NARSINGH
Advocate

D. C. CHOPRA, Manager
(Personnel & Administration)
Uranium Corporation of India Limited.

For the Petitioner
Complainant

(M. S. MURMU)
General Secretary

RTI of SMT. SINGHOO,
Petitioner-Complainant

Submitted on 9th February, 1976, at Calcutta.

BEFORE THE PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (NO. 2),

DHANBAD AT CALCUTTA
Complaint No. 1 of 1972

(Under Section 33-A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947)

PARTIES

Smt. Singhoo & Salgi, C/o. Jaduguda Labour Union,
P. O. Jaduguda Mines, Dt. Singhbhum, Bihar.

... Complainant

Vs.

M/s. Uranium Corporation of India Limited, P. O.
Jaduguda Mines, Dt. Singhbhum (Bihar)

... Opposite Party.

The Petition of Smt. Salgi

The above Complaint was filed by the Complainant in this Tribunal under Section 33-A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, against the termination of his lien on the services under the Opposite Party under clause 24(c) of the Certified Standing Orders.

2. The subject matter of the dispute has since been amicably settled between the parties after prolonged negotiations between the management and the Jaduguda Labour Union, representing the complainant, to their satisfaction on the terms hereinafter stated:—

- (i) The Opposite Party, as a special case, shall take back the applicant in its employment. The period of his/her absence from work from the date on which he/she had commenced his/her unauthorised absence till the date of his/her resumption of work in terms of this settlement, shall be treated by the management as extraordinary leave (non-medical).
- (ii) In view of this settlement on the above terms the Complainant has not lawfully subsisting cause of action, to continue to pursue his/her present complaint.
- (iii) The complainant, therefore, desires to withdraw his/her present complaint in the above circumstances.
- (iv) The complainant, therefore, prays that the Tribunal may be pleased to permit him/her to withdraw his/her present complaint against the management.
- (v) It is further prayed that the Tribunal may, therefore, be pleased to dispose of the present complaint in terms of this settlement.
- (vi) The Complainant will be taken back in service on the above terms on submitting the application to the Presiding Officer, Central Government Industrial Tribunal (No. 2), Dhanbad to withdraw his/their complaints under section 33-A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.
- (vii) The management has no objection to present complaint being disposed of as prayed for.

their wages regularly as per "Recommendations of the Central Wage Board for Coal Mining Industry", which may kindly be noted.

However, your honour is requested to kindly treat the above-said case as closed.

Thanking you.

Yours faithfully,

Sd/-

K. PANDEY, Secy.

ANNEXURE I

TELURAM MINERALS DEVELOPMENT (P) LTD.

Head Office :

11, OLD POST OFFICE ST.

CALCUTTA-1

Phone : 22-1201

Delhi Office

129/D, KAMLA NAGAR,

Delhi-7

Phone : 22-0824

Calcutta Office

14/1A GRANT LANE.

CALCUTTA-12.

P.O. CHIRKUNDA

(DHANBAD)

Phone Chirkunda 66

Barakar 337

Ref. No. TMD/TRB/76.

Dated 29-4-1976

To

The Presiding Officer.

Central Govt. Industrial Tribunal-

cum-Labour Court (No. 1), Dhanbad.

Dhanbad.

Reference No. 11 of 1975.

and your letter No.11/75/126 of 20-4-1976.

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Fatka Coke Oven of M/s. Teluram Minerals (P) Ltd. P.O. Nirsachatti, Dt. Dhanbad,

AND

Their Workmen

"SCHEDULE"

"Whether the action of the management of Fatka Coke Oven of M/s. Teluram Minerals Dev. (P) Ltd. P.O.—Nirsachatti, Dt. Dhanbad, in not implementing the Recommendations of the Central Wage Board for Coal Mining Industry is justified? If not to what relief are the workmen entitled and from what date?"

Dear Sir,

We like to intimate your goodself with the fact that our FATKA COKE OVEN is Registered under the Rule of "Small Scale Industries" and so we are not compelled to implement the "Recommendations of the Central Wage Board for Coal Mining Industry" for the workmen of our FATKA COKE OVEN.

However, in view of maintaining good relationship with our workmen as well as for bringing their full satisfaction, we are paying their wages as per "Recommendations of the Central Wage Board" and there is no such dispute between the above-said parties, which may kindly be noted.

Thanking you.

[No. L-2012/39/74(i)/LR. II/D. IIIA]

Yours faithfully,

Sd/- III.

Director

S.O. 2690.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 197 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court No. 1 Dhanbad in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Bengla Bhatta (English Bhatta) of Messrs Selected Fatka Colliery P.O. Nirsachatti Dhanbad and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 29-6-1976.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO. 1, DHANBAD

In the matter of a reference under Section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

Reference No. 12 of 1975.

(Ministry's Order No. L-2012/39/74-LR II(ii) Dt. 27-2-75)

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Bengla Bhatta (English Bhatta) of M/s Selected Fatka Colliery, Post Office Nirsachatti, Dhanbad.

AND

Their Workmen.

PRESENT :

Mr. Justice K. B. Srivastava (Retd.) Presiding Officer.

APPEARANCES :

For the Employers—Shri S. S. Mukherjee, Advocate.

For the Workmen—Shri K. Pandey, Secretary, Bihar Colliery Kamgar Union.

State : Bihar.

Industry : Coal.

Dhanbad, dated. June 22, 1976.

AWARD

The following dispute has been referred to this Tribunal by the Central Government, in exercise of its powers under clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, namely,—

"Whether the action of the management of Bengla Bhatta (English Bhatta) of Messrs Selected Fatka Colliery, Post Office Nirsachatti, Dhanbad, in not implementing the recommendations of the Central Wage Board for Coal Mining Industry, is justified? If not, to what relief are the workmen entitled and from what date?"

2. The parties have filed a compromise which consists of two parts, namely, one filed by Messrs Selected Fatka Colliery (Annexure I) signed by the Manager and the other filed by K. Pandey, Secretary, Bihar Colliery Kamgar Union (Annexure II).

3. Shri S.S.Mukherjee, Advocate for M/S. Selected Fatka Colliery appeared before the Tribunal on June 15, 1976 and verified the compromise (Annexure I) on behalf of the said company. K. Pandey, however, did not appear on that date because he is a Misa detainee. Today (June 22, 1976) Satrohan Prasad Sinha, a Member of the Executive Committee of the union has, however, appeared and not only verified the signature of K. Pandey on the compromise (Annexure II) but has further stated that it is fair and reasonable and in the interests of the union as also the workmen who are members thereof. The compromise (Annexure I & II) mentions that the dispute which has been referred, has been settled and the concerned workmen have already been paid their wages on the basis of the recommendations of the Central Wage Board for Coal Mining Industry. The award is, therefore, given in terms of the compromise (Annexures I & II) which shall form part of the award.

Sd/-

K. B. SRIVASTAVA.

ANNEXURE-I

Sisir Kumar Roy

Receiver Smt No. 902 of 1950
SELECTED FATKA COLLIERY

Phone No. Nirsachatti 28.

Colliery Office :

P.O. NIRSACHATTI
(DHANBAD)

Phone : CKD 26

P.O. KUMARDHUBI.

Dist. DHANBAD

Ref. No. SFC/68/120/76.

Dated 27-4-1976

To

The Presiding Officer,
Central Govt. Industrial Tribunal-
cum-Labour Court No. 1, Dhanbad.
Dhanbad.

Reference No. 12 of 1975

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the Management of Bangla
Bhatta of M/s. Sel. Fatka Colliery, P.O. Nirsachatti
(Dhanbad).

AND

Their workmen

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management of Bangla Bhatta
of M/s. Sel. Fatka Colliery (P.O. Nirsachatti,
Dhanbad) in not implementing the Recommendations
of the Central Wage Board for Coal Mining
Industry, is justified ? If not, to what relief are
the workmen entitled and from what date ?"

Dear Sir,

With reference to the above-said "Schedule" and your
letter No. 12/75/128 dated 20-4-1976, we are to let your
goodself know that there is no such dispute between the
above-said 2 parties as the concerned workmen have been
paid their wages as per "Recommendations of Central Wage
Board for Coal Mining Industry" which may kindly be
noted.

Thanking you,

Yours faithfully,

For Selected Fatka Colliery

Sd/- Illegible.

Manager

ANNEXURE II

BIHAR COLLIERY KAMGAR UNION

Regd. No. 1403 (Bihar) : Affiliated to C.I.T.U.
REFUGEE MARKET, TEMPLE ROAD, DHANBAD

Nirsachatti, Dated 26-4-1976

To

The Presiding Officer,
Central Government Industrial Tribunal-
cum-Labour Court (No. 1), Dhanbad.
Dhanbad.

Reference No. 12 of 1975

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Bangla
Bhatta of M/s. Selected Fatka Colliery, P.O. Nirsachatti,
Dhanbad

AND

Their workmen

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management of Bangla Bhatta
of M/s. Sel. Fatka Colliery, in not implementing
the Recommendations of the Central W. Board for
Coal Mining Industry, is justified ? If not, to what
relief are the workmen entitled and from what
date ?"

Ref. Your letter No. 12/75/128 dated 20-4-1976.

Dear Sir,

With reference to the above we are to inform your good-
self that the dispute between the above-said parties as speci-
fied in the "Schedule" has been settled and the concerned
workmen are being paid regularly their wages as per recom-
mendation of the Central Wage Board for Coal Mining
Industry, which may kindly be noted.

Considering the above, your honour is requested to kindly
treat this case as closed.

Thanking you,

Yours faithfully,

Sd/- K. Pandey.

SECRETARY

BIHAR COLLIERY KAMGAR UNION

[F. No. L-2012/39/74(ii) L.R II/D. IIIA]

R. P. NARULA, Under Secy.

